LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
OCT 5 1939
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BV 1471 .V5 1930
Vieth, Paul H. b. 1895.
Objectives in religious
education

OBJECTIVES IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

LIBRARY OF PRINCE
JUL 2 1930
THEOLOGICAL SEMIN

By

PAUL H. VIETH

**SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION**

With an Introduction by

LUTHER A. WEIGLE

Dean of the Divinity School
Yale University

HARPER & BROTHERS, *Publishers*
Mcmxxx NEW YORK *and* LONDON

OBJECTIVES IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Copyright, 1930, by Paul H. Vieth

Printed in the U. S. A.
FIRST EDITION
D–E

TO

HUGH S. MAGILL, LL.D.

General Secretary of The International Council of Religious Education

CONTENTS

Introduction ix
Preface xiii

Part One. The Place of Objectives in Religious Education.

I. THE MEANING OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.................. 3
II. THE NATURE AND FUNCTION OF OBJECTIVES............. 18
III. HOW SHALL OBJECTIVES BE DETERMINED?................ 35

Part Two. A Study in Comprehensive Objectives.

IV. NATURE AND SCOPE OF THIS STUDY...................... 57
V. WHAT, THEN, ARE THE OBJECTIVES?...................... 79
VI. GOD-RELATIONSHIP AS OBJECTIVE........................ 98
VII. JESUS CHRIST AS OBJECTIVE.......................... 121
VIII. CHRISTLIKE CHARACTER AS OBJECTIVE................... 142
IX. THE GOOD SOCIETY AS OBJECTIVE........................ 186
X. CHRISTIAN LIFE PHILOSOPHY AS OBJECTIVE................ 215
XI. THE CHURCH AS OBJECTIVE.............................. 233
XII. RACE HERITAGE AS OBJECTIVE.......................... 256

Part Three. The Next Steps—Specific Objectives.

XIII. DEFINING OBJECTIVES IN SPECIFIC TERMS................ 281

Appendices.

APPENDIX I—SOURCES ON WHICH THE STUDY IN OBJECTIVES WAS BASED 295
APPENDIX II—LIST OF REFERENCES TO SOURCE QUOTATIONS..... 317
GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY 322

Index 327

INTRODUCTION

This is a timely and needed book. The progress of educational theory and practice has thrown the problem of objectives to the fore. So long as education was conceived as a mere transmission of accumulated material from generation to generation, there was no such problem. The sole purpose of the teacher was to see to it that the pupil mastered the stuff, acquired the ideas, or got the habits which constituted the subject-matter of education.

But we have come to see that education should be more than the transmission of existing knowledge or the reproduction of existing skills. It has a creative function. It faces toward the future rather than toward the past—or better, it transmits the past only for the sake of a richer present and a growing future. To a boy who said, "Daddy, when I grow up I want to be just like you," the father answered, "If you should be just like me, I would be ashamed of you; you are standing on my shoulders." A dynamic, changing society looks to education for the development of those powers which enable it to cope with changing conditions and insure its progress.

Education today aims increasingly at the development within the growing pupil of free, dependable, creative personality. The spirit of such education is that of fellowship; its methods are as various as the forms of association in human activity. Under these conditions the problem is acutely raised: What purposes shall the teacher entertain, and how shall he undertake to realize them? What types of personality have value, and why? How shall the development of such personality be stimulated? What situations, what experiences, are of most value as tending to favor the emergence and growth of such personality?

Questions such as these, which are everywhere being raised with respect to education generally, are especially pertinent and meaningful with respect to religious education, which is in process of emerging from what was in many respects a merely transmissive stage. The progress from "uniform" to "graded" lessons, and from these to "life-centered" curricula, has awakened much questioning and widespread interest in the problem of the objectives or religious education.

Even among those who agree that we must move away from merely transmissive to creative education in the field of religious faith and life as well as in other fields, opposing tendencies are revealing themselves. One group clings to the term "religion," but is inclined to interpret it as social idealism and to ignore or even deny the existence of a metaphysically real, personal God. The other tendency is to emphasize more clearly the life and teaching of Jesus Christ, to stress his revelation of the character and disposition of God, and to substitute the term "Christian education" for the more ambiguous "religious education." This latter tendency characterized the discussions at two recent world-gatherings—the Jerusalem meeting of the International Missionary Council and the Los Angeles convention of the World's Sunday School Association.

Dr. Vieth has made a study of comprehensive objectives, based upon an analysis of the writings of leaders in the religious-educational movement, which marks a definite step forward. It sets the main problems into clear relief, and puts us into position to go on more intelligently to the formulation of specific objectives. Best of all, this is no merely academic procedure. This book records one phase of the work which its author has been doing as executive director of the curriculum enterprises of the Commission on Education of the International Council of Religious Education. Further work is in progress, upon an experimental basis, along the lines indicated here; and in this work are associated the forty-two Protestant denominations which are cooperating in the International Council.

L. A. WEIGLE

Yale University

PREFACE

THIS study in objectives was undertaken because of the author's conviction that progress in religious education demands a clearer conception of its nature and purpose. A first step in this direction requires a review and evaluation of the best thought on this subject. This study presents in organized form what ten leaders in religious education and four leaders in general education have to say cerning the objectives of religious education. Anyone who is more interested in the discussion of the objectives themselves than in the philosophy underlying objectives and the method by which this study was made, may skip from Chapter I to Chapter V without loss of essential continuity.

This book is a revision of the manuscript submitted by the author to the faculty of Yale University as a dissertation, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Ph.D. The technical framework of the original study has been removed, and the manuscript cast in more easily readable form.

It is not maintained that it is possible or desirable to secure unanimous agreement on any set of objectives. It is desirable, however, that we see as clearly and concisely as possible the various viewpoints which are held, and recognize the values in each viewpoint. The best result which could be hoped for would be that this study might stimulate others to carry farther the various lines of development which it has opened.

The author wishes to express his indebtedness to Dean Luther Allan Weigle for writing an introduction to this volume; also to Professor Weigle, Professor Gambrill, and other members of the faculty of the Yale School of Education for their supervision of this study and their helpful suggestions in the preparation of the manuscript; to Mr. Otto Mayer and Miss Lois Rogers who participated in the study; to Hugh S. Magill, General Secretary, and his associates on the International Council Staff for their encouragement and help; and to the men whose writings form the basic data for this study for their generous cooperation.

P. H. V.

December 21, 1929.

PART ONE

The Place of Objectives in Religious Education

CHAPTER I

THE MEANING OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

BEFORE we undertake a discussion on objectives in religious education, it is necessary that we come to an agreement with the reader on the nature and meaning of religious education as the term is used in these pages.

During the past quarter-century religious education has risen to a place of major importance in the life of the Christian church. The first wave of enthusiasm for the movement is now running out, but a more mature and permanent stage of interest is taking its place. The over-zealous are less frequently hailing religious education as the instrument for creating a new world in this generation, while those who declare that religious education is but a passing fad are rapidly decreasing in number. It is becoming obvious to the most casual observer that as religious education assumes the more stable lines of maturity a permanent place of major importance is being accorded it in the life and work of the church.

Many varying views have been held concerning the nature and purpose of religious education. Often the opposition to it has had its roots in some partial or distorted view of its meaning which would not be upheld by those who have been most concerned with its success. The time has come to review the experience of the past quarter-century and see whether we may discern the major outlines of this new instrument for religious progress. It is the object of this book thus to view the purposes of religious education as they are in process of taking shape.

Let us not suppose that the struggle for giving religious education its rightful place in the church has resulted in complete victory. The battle must still go on. While religious education has achieved a place of honor and is accorded a certain amount of lip service, it is yet far from coming into its own and yielding fruits meet to its capacity. A clearer conception of what religious education may accomplish cannot but turn the attention and energies of church leaders into its service more fully and fruitfully.

1. *The nature of religious education.* It is possible at this point to define religious education in a tentative manner only. To define the objectives of religious education is to define the thing itself more

completely. This entire book will therefore be directed toward the better understanding of what is meant by religious education. It is necessary, however, that we here make some definition of the term religious education as we propose to use it in the following pages.

Religious education is related *in kind* to the process of education in general. Its distinguishing criterion is that it has for its purpose the making of *religious* persons and the fostering of *religious* living. The meaning and importance which any person will attach to religious education will depend on the place he accords to religion itself as an interest and activity in life. In so far as general education sets complete living as its major objective, and includes religious interests and values in its definition of complete living, it has opened the way for making a place in its scheme of things for religious education.

We may distinguish two general tendencies in the effort to define religious education. One of these is exclusive in its viewpoint, attempting to set religious education apart from general education. In this narrow sense, religious education is thought of as a chapter in any inclusive scheme of education, definitely related to the whole in method perhaps, but more or less independent in content. According to this viewpoint, it is altogether feasible to give religious education in a school separate from that in which general education is offered. The content of the education going on in the two school systems being different, the two can be given at separate times and places, without violating the essential unity of the child's educational experience. Such interrelations as do exist spring largely from the necessity for schedule adjustments, and the desirability, for pedagogic purposes, of the pupils recognizing a continuity of the religious school with the public school.

The other tendency regards religious education in a more inclusive sense. According to this viewpoint, religious education embraces the whole of education, and the specifically religious school but adds emphasis and quality to what is already going forward wherever the educational function is being performed. Religion is concerned with all of life's values, and any education dealing with life is potentially religious. Those who advocate this viewpoint would insist, however, that this religious character should not simply be implicit, but should be recognized explicitly both by teachers and by those who are taught. Stated in its extreme form and with certain sectarian presuppositions, this viewpoint becomes the Catholic theory that "by a Catholic education is understood not merely the inclusion of religious courses in the curricula, but such teaching even of secular branches as involves the recognition of the unchangeable principles of Catholic philosophy, theology, and pedagogy."[1] The principle for which the Catholic theory is contending, without its sectarian bias, is found in the more liberal Protestant educators who maintain that all education in the best sense of that term is religious in spirit and purpose. The object of the distinctly religious school is not to aggravate the separation between religious and secular education, but to give more explicit expression to the religious spirit which is present in all education, and to provide for such sectarian interpretations as may be necessary and desirable. Weigle maintains that "quite aside from the question as to whether or not the church should undertake the maintenance of schools, it is clearly the church's duty to endeavor, in one way or another, to contribute Christian principles and motives to the whole of education, and to inspire it with Christian ideals."[2]

Coe does not draw a sharp distinction between religious education and education in general. Rather does he think of religious education as "education that completes itself by taking account of the whole child, the whole educator, and the whole goal or destiny of man," [3] and that "the primary difference between religious and other education is the end in view, or the conception of human life that it represents," [4] so that "for us religious education is simply education in the complete sense of that term." [5] On this basis it is difficult to say that any education is "secular" rather than religious. It is obvious however that a complete religious education transcends the ability of the present public school to give. Taking much the same position, Cope [6] maintains that all education is religious because it deals with persons who are by nature religious, and it deals with them for the ultimately religious purpose of helping them to live in a world of spiritual beings. In a sense its processes also are religious, since they are scientific only in so far as they are based on the unchanging laws of the universe as discovered in the natures of these spiritual beings. This discussion of the more inclusive view of the meaning of religious education would lead us to the position that the full life of education and the full life of religion are bound up with one another.

---

[1] Resolution passed by the College Department of the Catholic Education Association, Louisville, Ky., 1926, applying to all Catholic Schools and colleges.

[2] Weigle, L. A., *Report on American Education for Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work,* p. 2. Stockholm, 1925.

---

[3] Coe, G. A., *Education in Religion and Morals*, Fleming H. Revell, 1904, p. 26.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

[6] Cope, H. F., *Religious Education in the Church*, Scribners, 1918, p. 35.

Thus far we have presented the viewpoint of those who represent religious education. That there is a growing tendency on the part of those who are chiefly responsible for general education to look in the same direction is evident from various recent publications. A widely used text book in the principles of education[7] devotes an entire chapter to the place of religion in education. One of the best known authors on the curriculum includes religion as one of the ten areas of activities which constitute his major objectives.[8] More recently the Committee of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, which was commissioned to define the objectives of secondary education, has included as one of its four major objectives "To promote the development of an appreciation of the force of law and of love that is operating universally." In interpretation of this objective the committee makes the following comment:

---

[7] Chapman, J. C., and Counts, G. S., *Principles of Education.* Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

[8] Bobbitt, Franklin, *How to Make a Curriculum*, chap. ii, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

> Man craves more than a knowledge of himself, of nature, and of organized society. He hungers and he thirsts after righteousness. Knowing his own imperfections, he feels that somewhere there is perfection. The great universe calls to his spirit, and unless he ignorantly or willfully closes his ears, he hears the voice of God. No question of theology or of ecclesiastical polity is involved here. The individual soul reaches out to orient itself in the universe and to find its place of labor and rest. No partial view suffices. Only the view of the whole, the *Weltanschauung*, will make it possible to interpret the meanings of day by day experience. When this orientation takes place, life assumes poise, dignity, grandeur. Otherwise its striving, its struggles, its achievements seem trivial and insignificant.
>
> No greater task rests upon the secondary school than to help its pupils to find their God. How this is to be done is the greatest of problems. Of one thing only are we sure: We cannot solve this problem by ignoring it. There is no single way to apprehend Infinity. Each in his own way may draw near.[9]

It is this broader conception of religious education which is maintained in this book.

2. *The place of religion in life and education.* The content of religious education is religion itself. It is not possible to describe the meaning of religious education apart from the conception of the meaning of religion which is implied in the use of the term. Religion is an essential and inalienable ingredient of human experience. Its value is not simply instru-

---

[9] Department of Superintendence—*Sixth Yearbook*, 1928, p. 54.

mental, but is intrinsic as well. Like beauty and companionship, it is required by men in the simple fulfillment of their lives.[10] Religion is the total response of the individual to that which he holds to be of supreme worth, and leads to harmonious adjustment to his total environment.[11] In addition to this essential value, religion undoubtedly also has great instrumental value in the promotion of other interests, particularly morality. "Education remains defective and falls short of its full end if it fails to beget the loyalty to eternal principles, the good will, the creative responsibility which enter into the making of moral character; and moral character is most surely established only when it is undergirded and sustained by a faith that the constitution of the universe itself is moral, and that moral values are therefore eternal. That faith, that conviction, is religion." [12] "So interwoven in the thoughts and actions of men have they become, that to distinguish the moral from the religious is now difficult. Indeed, religion in its highest form has been aptly defined as morality touched with emotion, and, perhaps one might add, *with meaning*."[13] If religion occupies such an important place in life, any comprehensive education must include the teaching of religion. While the problem of the genesis of religion in the life of the individual awaits for its solution the findings of much more extensive research in the psychology of religion, and while the existence of the Object of religious devotion is and remains a question to which science alone cannot give an ultimate answer, from the standpoint of its intrinsic value in human life, and its pragmatic value in giving meaning and drive to other values, religion demands its rightful place in the education of every child.

---

[10] Chapman, J. C., and Counts, G. S., *Principles of Education*, p. 344, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

[11] Searles, H. L., *School and Society*, xxvii, 157.

[12] Weigle, Luther A., *Religious and Secular Education*, p. 3, American Tract Society.

We must proceed a step further in defining the use of the term religion. In ordinary usage morality has to do with ideals of conduct while religion has to do with man's relation to a Supreme Being. Yet one often finds a life of aspiration or of devotion to ideals spoken of as religion. If religion be defined as "man's highest response to what he considers highest," it is obvious that "the highest" may be defined in terms either of an abstract ideal or of an existent reality. Professor Macintosh has called this response to a divine ideal *fundamental religion*, as distinct from *experimental religion*, or response to a Supreme or Divine Being.

---

[13] Chapman, J. C., and Counts, G. S., *Principles of Education*, p. 340, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

> Fundamental and experimental religion may be regarded as two phases of religion, discoverable and separable by analytical thought. In its concrete reality religion is a synthesis of the cosmic and social attitudes. Our attitude toward nature is cosmic; our attitude toward humanity, social; our religion—*i.e.*, our attitude toward the Divine—tends to be both cosmic and social. "Fundamental religion" stands for the isolation of the social element in religion, recognition of and aspiration toward ideal social values. "Experimental religion" stands for the cosmic element in religion, dependence and various other experimental relations toward the ruling Power in the cosmos.[14]

Macintosh further makes the point that fundamental religion even in its highest forms is not sufficient to meet all of the religious needs of men. It needs the stimulus of religion in the more usual and specific sense of the word, if its highest development is to be reached. "For steady aspiration there is need of inspiration ever new."[15] It would seem a fair position to take that these two viewpoints of religion are but phases in one complete whole and that the one without the other does not define religion in the true sense of the term—certainly not in the Christian sense of the term. The interpretation adopted by the present writer is that the distinguishing criterion of a religious experience is its ultimate reference to a Supreme Being. In this sense "Education becomes religious when it is conscious of the presence, power, and love of God as the ultimate condition and supreme motive of human life, which includes and integrates all lesser values and motives whose proximate end is some form of human welfare." [16]

---

[14] Macintosh, D. C., *The Reasonableness of Christianity*, p. 41, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

3. *The Christian interpretation of religion.* No attempt was made to limit the above discussion to religion in the Christian sense of the term. Since, however, this book is to deal primarily with education from the viewpoint of Protestant Christian churches, the term *religious education* will be used throughout in the sense of the Christian religion. A more exact term would be *Christian religious education.* The term *Christian education* is sometimes used to designate the type of education here described, but we have rejected it for our present purpose because it has been so largely preëmpted by the Christian college to describe its total program of work.

Narrowing the interpretation of religion to the

---

[16] Weigle, L. A., "What Makes Education Religious?" in *Religious Education*, April, 1923, p. 91.

Christian viewpoint does not make it different in kind from the definition which has been given above. It does, however, add the qualifying criterion of *Christian*, which implies the ultimate reference of experience to God as we know him in and through Jesus Christ. "Christianity is the Christocentric religion, a Christlike attitude toward a Christlike God for the sake of realizing Christlike purposes in the individual life and in the world."[17] Religious experience on this plane, interpreted through the personality and teachings of Jesus, consists, on the one hand, in an experience of and with God, and on the other hand in a devotion to the highest ideals, resulting in ethical unity with the purpose of God, and the resulting beliefs inherent in and growing out of such experience. All experience becomes religious, and to the Christian *is* religious, if it is conditioned by and lived under this consciousness of God and oneness with him and his purpose. There is then no discontinuity between the religious and the secular. To one who knows God as Father in the Christian sense, and has this Christian philosophy of life, the universe itself becomes friendly and expressive of God's power and purpose, and every human relation becomes potentially religious.

---

[17] Macintosh, D. C., *The Reasonableness of Christianity*, p. 156, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.

4. *Education as religious growth.* If education be thought of as a series of progressive changes toward an objective—that is, a process of growth —then religious education must be a process of growth in religious experience and life. As such, it is continuous with life itself, for the possibility of growth is not only always present, but should indeed be encouraged to the full at every stage of maturity. The processes of education for spiritual growth represent the human endeavor to enable each growing individual to adjust himself to his total environment, with particular reference to spiritual values. Religious education is not a substitute for the work of the Divine in human life, but sets as its task such working with God in bringing about right religious adjustment that the highest spiritual development of the learner may take place. Any process of growth will no doubt have its hills and valleys, its periods of greater and lesser intensity. Some experiences will overshadow others in their potency for producing growth. Some may even be so marked with emotional concomitants as to seem different in kind from all others. Each individual must advance according to the laws of his own being, and the true measure of growth

in the religious life is the fruit of the spirit. It follows that if religiousness in the individual is the resultant of growth, then religion itself must become responsive to the influence of education, with the possibility of change and development.

CHAPTER II

THE NATURE AND FUNCTION OF OBJECTIVES

THERE is no general agreement on what should constitute the objectives of religious education. In most cases, when objectives are expressed at all, they are stated in terms of such generalized theological preconceptions, that, if educational procedure should take account of such goals, it would constitute a sin against the nature of the child. Often they are stated in such abstract terms as to provide utterly inadequate guidance to procedure. It is inevitable under these circumstances that much of religious education today should be so purposeless, so bewildered, and so thoroughly unscientific as to merit the scorn of the true educator.

1. *What are educational objectives?* An objective is a statement of a result consciously accepted as a desired outcome of a given process. It springs from the recognition that there are alternative consequences which may follow from acting in given situations in different ways. It signifies that an activity has been raised to the level of consciousness,

where the desired outcome may enter as a factor in controlling the possible ways of responding to given situations. An objective introduces foresight into a process and uses the anticipated outcome in directing that process.[1]

Educational objectives are statements of desired outcomes to be achieved through the process of education. Their function is to set a mark in advance. They constitute the goal for which education exists—the *raison d'être* for its being. Objectives are to education what the architectural drawing is to the builder or the vision of an abundant harvest to the farmer. With a goal in view, proper activities may be selected for reaching that goal, each in its proper sequence, and their success measured by the criterion of the results achieved toward the building of a house according to pattern or the production of a harvest in abundance.

There is a sense, however, in which this figure is inadequate as an illustration of educational objectives. Education is a process which is coextensive with life. Its result cannot be stated in terms of finished products, such as houses and crops, except in so far as successive attainment signifies stages of achievement in a constantly on-going process. In this sense the function of objectives is that of a compass to the mariner, an instrument by which activities may be directed toward the successful achievement of many specific goals. Educational objectives must be so stated as to provide for a conception of society, not as something which is, but as forever becoming. But such progressive revision of objectives can most intelligently be made when the desired general direction is known.

---

[1] Dewey, John, *Democracy and Education*, p. 129, The Macmillan Company.

2. *The function of educational objectives.* Objectives are essential to effective education. They serve at least five major purposes: (1) Objectives give direction to the processes through which desirable changes are to be realized. Though the very essence of education is the promotion of changes, change in itself is no virtue. The change must be in a given desirable direction. (2) Objectives serve to give proper sequence to educational activities. They introduce meaning into the process. (3) Objectives serve as guides to activity through which desirable changes may be produced. Activity[2] as such is a function of human life which is present in every waking moment. It becomes educational only

---

[2] The word "activity" as used here is not limited to the usual meaning of overt physical acts, but is used in the more general sense of including mental and intellectual decisions, emotional reactions, and other non-physical responses. (See Charters, W. W., *The Teaching of Ideals*, chap. ii, The Macmillan Company, 1927.)

when it is directed in the light of possible alternative consequences resulting from the reactions to given situations. (4) Objectives serve as guides to the selection of materials for use in the effective carrying out of desirable activities. (5) Finally, objectives serve as measures of the effectiveness of the educational processes. They provide the norm of desirable changes produced. They serve as the divining rods of progress. To insist that the educator must know the goal of his undertaking is imperative if education is to realize its high purpose for society.

3. *Individual or social goals.* The objectives of education may be stated either in terms of changes to be brought about in individuals or changes to be brought about in society. Both approaches are found in the literature on objectives, and often the same author will look at the matter now from one viewpoint and again from another. This is the inevitable result of the close interrelation of the individual and society. It may be argued with equal success that society consists fundamentally of individuals or that individuals have no existence apart from society. Unless we limit ourselves to an otherworldly viewpoint in determining our values, we may again argue with equal effectiveness either that the individual is the unit of primary concern or that

society should challenge our greatest interest. We may therefore approach the question of objectives from either the individual or the social aspect. To avoid confusion, however, the viewpoint should not be shifted now to the one and now to the other.

In this discussion we shall approach the statement of objectives from the standpoint of desirable changes in individuals. Fundamentally, education deals with individuals. While its purpose may be either individual or social welfare, or perhaps more truly the welfare of both individuals and society, such values are brought about through producing desirable changes in individuals. It is true that the educator may manipulate the situation in which an individual is placed in order to bring about more desirable responses, but again his emphasis is upon the changed response in the individual. It is not a question here of whether the individual or society is to be considered of greatest importance, but merely a question of the way in which education may work. In cases where the value at stake is social in nature, the statement of educational objectives will be in terms of the development of the kind of individual who will function in producing the type of social ideal in question.

Religious education, as carried on by the churches, has centered its objectives largely in the individual. Often this has been at the expense of emphasis on social ideals. Perhaps this is a natural consequence of the Christian conviction of the ultimate worth of the individual. While much stress in recent years has been laid on the social gospel, there is good evidence for the belief that Jesus was concerned primarily with the welfare of the individual, and in advocating the good society, never lost sight of the abundant life as a worthy end for the citizen in that society, and as the best means for developing the society itself. In advocating this viewpoint Russell Henry Stafford maintains that "In addressing himself primarily and almost exclusively to the hearts of men rather than to their institutions, Jesus went to the root of human living in all its phases." [3] The position of the church on this point is clearly set forth in the following quotation from Weigle: "The primary interest of the church is in persons; its concern is for the enrichment of their experience, the development of their character, and the quality of their services as free, responsible, cooperative members of the human race. In the power of the Spirit of God, the church undertakes the regeneration and Christian education of individuals."[4]

---

[3] "The Interpretation of Life" in *The Congregationalist*, March, 1928.

4. *Sociological and psychological statements of objectives.* Stated from the standpoint of desirable outcomes in individuals, objectives may be thought of in terms either of *sociological* goals or *psychological* goals. As an example of the former, we may cite the seven *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*, as stated by the commission on reorganization of secondary education in 1918:[5] (1) health, (2) command of fundamental processes, (3) worthy home-membership, (4) vocation, (5) citizenship, (6) worthy use of leisure, and (7) ethical character. As an example of the latter, we may cite the statements in terms of (1) fruitful knowledge, (2) right attitudes, (3) skill in living, as given by Betts,[6] and also used in slightly different form by Bonser,[7] Gambrill,[8] and others. Both types of objectives are essential to a complete statement of aim. If the sociological approach is made basic, the effective attainment of a given value de-

---

[4] *Christianity and Social Adventuring* (Jerome Davis, editor), p. 260, Century Company, 1927.

[5] United States Bureau of Education, *Bulletin* No. 35, 1918.

[6] Betts, George H., *How to Teach Religion*, p. 47, The Abingdon Press, 1919.

[7] Bonser, Frederick G., *The Elementary School Curriculum*, p. 26, The Macmillan Company, 1920.

[8] "Progressive Trends in Lower Elementary Education" in *Michigan Education Journal*, 1927, pp. 343, 344.

pends upon the achievement of such psychological changes as will bring about the desired conduct. If, on the other hand, the psychological statement of objectives is used as basic, the sociological values must be invoked to provide content for the psychological aspects of the process. In a certain sense the psychological factors are the ultimate objectives of education, for it is through them that the purposes of education are ultimately achieved. In another sense, however, these factors are mediate to the achievement of the more complex conduct goals to which we have given the term sociological. In other words, the psychological goals have no existence apart from the sociological values which it is their function to achieve.

An adequate statement of objectives includes both the sociological and the psychological factors. In the sociological sense the objective sets forth the desirable conduct to be achieved; in the psychological sense it presents an analysis of the factors through which control may be brought about. Thus, the sociological goal may be that of helpfulness to mother in the performance of home tasks. The psychological factors entering in may be defined as: (1) the attitude of desiring to help; (2) knowledge of the obligations involved in family life; (3) skill in the doing of the home tasks; (4) the habit of helping wherever possible. In a similar way almost every goal can be analyzed into a group of psychological factors which are essential to its attainment.

These two types of objectives are, therefore, but different ways of looking at an essentially unitary process. Much confusion in thinking has resulted from an intermingling of the two approaches in the same series of objectives because of lack of recognition that they are but different viewpoints. To avoid this difficulty, Gambrill[9] has endeavored to introduce both viewpoints into one comprehensive statement, and for this purpose has coined the term "socio-psychological goals." It seems to the present writer that a statement of objectives which looks at the whole child as active in the achievement of self-realization through the situations he meets, that is, the "sociological" approach, is the more fundamental, and that the psychological goals —attitudes and ideals, skills, habits, knowledge— should be regarded as mediate to that end.

5. *Conduct values as goals.* It is possible to state objectives in terms of certain effects to be produced in character, or in terms of specific responses to be made to situations. If we mean by character the likelihood that a given response will be made to situations of a kind, and if we understand that re-

[9] In an unpublished paper.

sponses of a kind are the expression of character, then these two approaches are very similar. It becomes only a matter of convenience whether objectives shall be stated in terms of desirable character or in terms of specific responses.

Objective observation is dependent for its data on overt acts. This has led to an emphasis on conduct outcomes as the goal of education. Conduct is the result of reacting to situations. We have defined education as a process of producing changes, which is to say, the continuous reconstruction of experience in the light of higher values. Its success will, therefore, be measured in terms of the extent to which selection is made of better alternative responses to the situations which must be met.

The word *situation* used in the above discussion deserves a word of interpretation. In dealing with educational values from the standpoint of conduct, we do not imply that the meaning of conduct is exhausted by what we can see in overt acts. One conceivable way of defining the term situation is, of course, to let it designate only the combined objective factors which constitute the pattern of stimuli to which response is made. For the sake of simplicity in describing situations objectively this may be a desirable definition. To assume, however, that this includes all the factors which influence the response is to describe the matter in terms which are far too simple. The same objective factors do not constitute identical patterns of stimuli to different persons or to the same person at different times. To describe a situation completely requires that account be taken of both the subjective and the objective factors. Woodworth maintains that ". . . we have to find room in our stimulus-response psychology for action persistently steered in a certain direction by some cause acting from within the individual. We must find room for *internal* states that *last* for a time and *direct* action."[10] Weigle finds four factors or principles in a complete situation-response pattern:

> (1) The stimulus to expression lies in the situation confronting one. All actions are in a certain sense reactions. We act because the situation calls for action. . . .
>
> (2) The material of expression comes largely from within. What we shall do or say depends upon our instincts, feelings, habits, and ideas.
>
> (3) The direction or end of expression depends upon the needs felt in the presence of a situation. The same situation may elicit widely different motives. We may distinguish three fundamental types of needs: (a) adaptive, making for adjustment to the physical environment; (b) imitative, making for conformity to the social environment; (c) social, leading to entrance as a self-active individual into the give and take of social relationships and into the work of the world.

---

[10] Woodworth, R. S., *Psychology*, p. 71, Henry Holt & Co., 1921.

> (4) Expression reacts to determine the meaning of situations. Little children define most objects in terms of what they can do with them. It is one trait of childhood which we never quite outgrow; nor should we. . . .[11]

When we think of education in terms of a constant reconstruction of experience, our purpose becomes the varying of responses to a situation by changing the internal factors. While for pedagogical purposes we may manipulate situations themselves in order to produce desired responses, our primary concern in so doing is to facilitate the formation of behavior patterns which will tend to insure that right responses will be made to the numerous situations over which we have no control.

In present-day discussion of moral and religious education the term *life-situations* is frequently encountered. It might with justice be urged that any situation is a *life* situation, for the essential character of a situation is that of a person in relation to certain external and internal factors and conditions. The emphasis, however, is on the desirability that educational situations shall be related to the on-going experience of the child's everyday life, rather than removed from life as a purely schoolroom activity. There are some who would hold that effective education can go forward only when the learner is engaged in activities in their natural setting. Thus, Christian service may be learned only through the pupil's engaging in *actual* service activities. A more conservative viewpoint, laying no less emphasis upon the necessity of education's meeting the needs of life, would yet admit that the effectiveness of an educational enterprise is judged not so much by the extent to which it is actually carried on in its natural setting, as by the extent to which it *relates* itself to the many and varied interests and activities of life. Thus, the meaning of Christian service, for example, might be greatly enlarged, and its effectiveness increased, by even a classroom consideration of the principles of Christian service, provided this study bears a vital relation to ongoing service activities. According to this viewpoint a life situation is one which the child recognizes as having significance and meaning for him. Such significance and meaning is not dependent upon its relation to the primary experience of the child, but may be just as real because of its relation to his vicarious experience through mental activity.

---

[11] "The Psychological Basis of Worship" in *Religious Education*, vol. ix., October, 1914, p. 421.

In an article entitled "What Are Life Situations?" Reeder points out that the duty of the school "is not alone to *select* life situations, but to *create* them through enriching and beautifying the vicarious lives of the children and giving significance and meaning to various facts and ideas which never enter into their actual everyday existence."[12] He further maintains, "To summarize, life situations cannot be defined in terms of the situations themselves; they must be defined in terms of the attitude of the learner. They are those situations which the child recognizes as having meaning and significance to him. This meaning and significance springs in part from the out-of-school life of the child but also to a large degree from his cumulative vicarious experience. School experience becomes real and vital in proportion as the teaching makes it so, through the use of a multiplicity of interesting details of how people live and work."[13]

With this interpretation of the terms *conduct* and *situation*, the position of the present writer will be clear. In defining objectives in terms of conduct values, it is not our purpose to overlook the more internal and subjective factors which condition conduct. Our desire is simply to view the whole child as active in meeting his situations, rather than emphasizing any particular psychological factor which may be operative.

6. *Types of objectives*. Objectives may be either

---

[12] Reeder, Edwin H., *Teachers College Record*, February, 1928, p. 414.

[13] Reeder, Edwin H., *Teachers College Record*, February, 1928, pp. 415, 416.

comprehensive[14] or *specific.* Comprehensive objectives are the more general statements of values to be achieved by religious education. Specific objectives are the desired outcomes in the experience of growing persons which are necessary steps in realizing the more comprehensive objectives, or which are specific instances of the comprehensive objectives. The following is an example of a comprehensive objective: "The development of Christlike character." One specific objective under this comprehensive statement might be, "The practice of returning lost property to its rightful owner."

The function of comprehensive objectives is more to state the purpose of education than to state the specific achievements which it may be desired to attain at a given time or in a given age group. Their service is to keep before the mind the whole of which each specific activity may form a part. Comprehensive objectives are essential in setting the general trend of education and in interpreting such specific movements as may be initiated in the

[14] The term "comprehensive objective" is here used in preference to the more common terms "general object" or "ultimate objective." The term "general" when used to describe an objective gives to some the impression that it is less to be desired than a "specific" objective, when in fact the two are names for two different types of objectives, each with its own function. The term "ultimate" gives an impression of finality which is unfortunate in a study of this sort.

course of carrying out its function. *Specific* objectives are essential because they are concrete, proximate, and capable of easy translation into actual programs of school work. The danger of stating objectives in comprehensive terms is that they may be remote, intangible, unreal, and unserviceable. Dewey[15] points out that if we mean by a general objective that it is abstract and detached from all specific context, so that teaching and learning become means which are disconnected from the ultimate end, such an objective is worthless. If, on the other hand, an objective is general only in the sense that its ramified connections which lead out indefinitely into many relations and functions of life are seen, and the general idea makes us more alive to these connections, it cannot be too general. The danger of stating objectives in specific terms is that they may become dissociated from the comprehensive aims of education, by which orientation must be made, and consequently may be lacking in meaning or validity.

There is actually no line of demarcation which can be drawn between comprehensive and specific objectives. While each type may easily be recognized in its extreme expression, when specific objectives become more comprehensive, and when comprehensive objectives become more specific they tend to shade one into the other. As a matter of fact, such division into comprehensive and specific is justifiable only from the standpoint of practicable usability—never from the standpoint of assuming to accept one type in preference to the other. Unless the two types of objectives serve as complements one to the other, we do not have a satisfactory statement of educational goals.

---

[15] Dewey, John, *Democracy and Education*, pp. 127, 128, The Macmillan Company, 1916.

Our discussion in this book will be concerned primarily with comprehensive objectives. It is in this field that the beginning must be made. Following the emergence of the main outlines of a series of comprehensive objectives, careful study and research must be given to reducing them to specific and concrete terms so that they may be translated into fruitful educational activity. This is a long-term process. All we may hope to do in this brief treatise is to show the main directions in which the task must move.

CHAPTER III

HOW SHALL OBJECTIVES BE DETERMINED?

IF WE may assume that we have established the need for objectives in religious education and described in a measure the types of objectives which will be most fruitful, we must next concern ourselves with the method by which such objectives may be determined. Clear vision and painstaking work are required in this undertaking. In the process there will be met some of the most debated questions in modern education.

1. *Child interests and social needs*. Two fundamental philosophies of objectives are striving for mastery in modern educational theory. The one holds that it is incumbent upon the adult generation to prepare the young to share its aspirations and ideals and to participate in its institutions. The other contends that childhood has its own life to live, and that the best that the adult generation can do for the young is to help them live their lives most abundantly as children. The one thinks primarily of the years of maturity and sees in child-

hood the golden opportunity to prepare for the activities of adult life. The other thinks primarily of the child in his present situations, and contends that the situations to be met at each stage of growth are the best preparation for the years which are ahead.

Stated in their extreme form, these two philosophies are in direct opposition to one another, and, it may be added, there is much of truth and much of error in each. Education as preparation for the life which the adult regards as good has characterized most of the school work of the past, and still dominates the thinking of the popular mind. Plato's educational scheme as preparation for life in the Ideal Republic is a classical example of this theory. An emphasis on the teaching of the Bible as the final revelation of God's will and the sole guide to faith and practice as interpreted by adults, the doctrinal teaching of the faith as the final truth delivered by the saints, the teaching of infallible rules of conduct—these are some of the manifestations of this educational philosophy in religion. The Catholic system of education is often held up as the extreme example of adult domination of childhood development, but much of Protestant education is little different in purpose. The goal of such education is fixed in adult values; it seeks to make miniature adults in thought and purpose of growing boys and girls, and consequently brings about a hopeless lag between childhood interest and school experience. Its tendency is to produce a static society, according to the patterns held to be best by each adult generation.

Over against this tendency has been that of exalting the child. Coming as a wholesome reaction to an education which was concerned too much with preparation for adult society, it has proceeded—true to the nature of protests—to set up a theory at the opposite extreme. The present life of the child has been made the supreme value, and the slogan, "the need of the child is the law of the school," has often been translated to mean "the caprice of the child." The advocates of this viewpoint are wary of setting up any kind of objective lest they violate the inalienable right of the child to freedom. The process of living is itself held to be the best sort of preparation for life. Any attempt on the part of adults to control the outcome of that process of living in harmony with tried ideals is looked upon as "the dead hand of the past" seeking to enthrall the free spirit of youth. Thus, Bertrand Russell voices an objection against immersing defenseless children in the atmosphere of the older generation's faiths, political and religious. Kilpatrick says, "Any effort on our part to tie them to our chosen ways may well be by just that much to tie their hands or, worse, bind their minds where they most need to be unshackled."[1] Writing concerning the teaching of religion, the same author states his position as follows:

> We may sum the discussion to this point by concluding (i) that it is possible to "train" and "indoctrinate" a child in some factional or sectarian position in such fashion and degree that under ordinary conditions when he is old he will not depart from it; (ii) that success in this is no guarantee of the correctness of the position; (iii) that from a study of history the parents' belief in their own rectitude is likewise no guarantee of correctness of position. But this is not all. Without necessity of argument we may further assert (iv) that parents and other elders have often managed to use the child as means to the end of upholding some faction or dogma dear to their hearts. We need not impugn motives. The fact remains unshaken. In the light of all this it is then finally submitted that intentionally so to "train" and "indoctrinate" is (v) to violate fundamentally that respect for the child's personality essential to ethics and is besides in probability (vi) to do the child a positive disservice as he faces a civilization changing as never before.[2]

The problem confronting the educator is just this: What period of life does the school primarily contemplate as its end—adult life or the present life of the learner? As far as we are able to judge, neither of the above theories has been fully successful in achieving what its advocates have claimed for it. Neither child life nor adult life has properly been taken care of by education in the past.

---

[1] Kilpatrick, W. H., *Education for a Changing Civilization*, pp. 108 f, The Macmillan Company, 1926.

[2] "Thinking in Childhood and Youth" in *Religious Education*, February, 1928, pp. 135, 136.

The answer to this problem will not be found by accepting either viewpoint wholly, to the exclusion of the other. Neither viewpoint has a monopoly on truth. Both emphases are needed if we are to have a well-balanced education. From the very nature of development it should be understood that there can be no conflict between proper education and preparation for later life. "Childhood and adulthood are bound together through continuous development. Each stage in this succession has a character and quality of its own, and this fact lends emphasis to the desirability of taking account of immediate experiences of child life in determining practices and procedures of education." "Each stage must leave the individual best prepared to live the next stage, and through this all others. Each stage overlaps on the preceding and succeeding stages." The best test of effectiveness of education in any particular stage is the effectiveness with which subsequent situations are met by the individuals so

Taken from
26th Yr Bk of
N.S.S.E.
chapt. one

educated. In this sense there is no escaping the fact that education is preparation for what is to follow, as well as guidance in present situations.[3]

As a matter of fact, it is sheer foolishness to speak of being unwilling as adults to set goals for childhood development. By the very fact of undertaking to educate we have already set a goal. Even in assuming that the highest value which may result from education is open-mindedness and the ability to meet new situations in a changing world, we have set a goal. We might with force ask the questions, "Whatever is the good of adult experience if it is not to be a guide to the experience of the young? If each generation must build its own techniques for meeting the situations of life, how is progress ever to be possible?" Even one of those quoted above as advocating the viewpoint of freedom for the child insists that there are "certain things so useful for future progress in school and life, both immediate and more remote, that we should use compulsion, if need be, to get them, so important that if they are not got otherwise there would eventually come a time when we should, if need be, drop practically everything else and compel the learning of them."[4] Having once admitted this in theory, it is only a matter of opinion whether such minimum essentials should be limited to the teaching of fundamental processes or whether there should be included such basic conduct goals as honesty in the situations which are met day by day in the light of our highest understanding of that term, open-mindedness with respect to new issues until adequate data are available for sound judgment, and so forth. In short, there is an obligation growing out of adult membership in society to provide such guidance and enrichment for the experience of the young as is possible in the light of the best experience of the past. This position is well stated by W. E. Hocking in the following quotation:

---

[3] This general position is advocated in the report of the Curriculum Committee of the National Society for the Study of Education. See the *Twenty-sixth Yearbook*, part ii, pp. 12, 13.

> The first peril of education is not that the child's will will be over-borne, but that through no exposure or inadequate exposure to the objects that would call out his best responses, he achieves only half a will instead of a whole one, a will partly developed and, therefore, feebly initiative, casual, spiritless, uninterested. . . . The greatest danger of politically guided education, particularly in democracies which feel themselves obliged in their education enterprises to cancel out against one another the divergent opinions of various parties, is that the best places will be *left blank*, because it is on the most vital matters that men most differ. Children have rights which education is bound to respect. The first of these rights is not that they be left free to choose their way of life, *i.e.*,

---

[4] Kilpatrick, W. H., *Foundations of Method*, pp. 365, 366, The Macmillan Company, 1925.

> to make bricks without either straw or clay. Their first right is that they be offered something positive, the best the group has so far found. Against errors and interested propaganda the growing will has natural protection: it has *no protection against starvation*.[5]

It is true that such a position as we have here voiced is subject to danger, but that is a risk involved in taking a position on any issue in life. It is readily granted that in the past too much emphasis has been laid upon imposing adult patterns of response on children. Modern educational psychology gives us no ground for hoping that an education which is unrelated to the situations and interests of the child who is to be educated will be in any great measure effective in producing desired changes. "In times past, and too much in the present, school practice has imposed adult forms of thought, feeling, and behavior upon children. It must, indeed, be recognized that the best conceivable forms of adult behavior represent goals toward which the education of the child must proceed. But, much more vigorously than has been true in the past, it must be recognized that the steps necessary in moving toward these goals are dictated by the character of the child's interests, needs, capacities for learning, and experiences, as well as by the larger demands of society."[6] Without question the new emphasis upon the place and importance of a child in the educational process and the intrinsic value of his own experience will have a wholesome influence on education in the future. The position we have here taken may best be summarized by an illustration (for which we are indebted to Professor Charters) which conceives education as an ellipse with two foci, rather than as a circle with one center. The two points about which the circumference of the ellipse is drawn represent the child, on the one hand, and society, on the other. If the needs of both are kept in right relation to each other we are in a fair way toward developing an educational theory adequate to the needs of today.

---

[5] *Human Nature and Its Remaking*, pp. 259, 260, Yale University Press.

2. *Philosophical versus scientific method in defining objectives.* The choice of method by which the objectives of religious education may be determined is one of the most significant problems to be faced. Previous to the present scientific era in education, it was quite permissible to select not only objectives, but procedures as well, on the basis of assumption. Anyone who had hit upon what seemed to him a good theory might immediately proceed to put that theory into practice, with full assurance

---

[6] "The Foundations of Curriculum-making," part ii, *The Twenty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, p. 12.

that the grounds on which he was working were just as adequate as those on which other persons worked. In recent years the scientific method has been introduced into the study of educational problems. No important questions may now be decided except in the light of investigation and experimentation. Valuable data have been made available through this method and great improvements have taken place in educational procedure. There are those who hopefully look to the scientific method as a means through which determination of objectives may be brought about.

But having fled from the haphazard method of assumption in determining objectives into the arms of the scientific method, we are perhaps in the same position as the man who fled from a lion only to meet a bear. May it not be that for the welfare of education the second stage is worse than the first?

Voices are not wanting to call our attention to the impossibilty of determining ultimate objectives by scientific method. The fact that the scientific method has resulted in great achievements in educational psychology, methodology, tests and measurements, and curriculum content means nothing unless we know whither we are trending. The question of aims for religious education cannot be answered except in terms of Christian living. In determining what is the abundant life many values must be taken into consideration, and the choice among these contending values will be made in the light of one's philosophy of life.

(The ultimate aims of education can only be determined by philosophy, and when they have thus been determined, scientific research can minister to them.) Professor Bode maintains that if the curriculum is to be genuinely humanized it must be based on social vision and program, so that the schools of the future may anticipate the spirit and outlook of the social order that is to be. The concept of democracy involves a program of living and the formulation of such a program is an undertaking in philosophy rather than in science.

*There is much talk at present of education as a science, but education as a science has a significant place only on the basis of a social program or educational philosophy. Take away this program, and the result is bewilderment and futility. The current enthusiasm for "scientific education" is all too often oblivious to the fact that any guiding principle is necessary. Many of our educational leaders seem to approach their task without any definite point of orientation, without any clear consciousness of whence we have come and whither we ought to go. Hence we have the pathetic notion that the way to get our bearings is to dig down into the dirt instead of taking a survey of the landscape. We are advised to "study the facts," the idea being that statistics will tell us not only what is, but what ought to be. . . . The development of such a program

> (of living) is ordinarily considered to be an undertaking in philosophy rather than in science. But that is perhaps largely a question of names. What is important in the present connection is that such a program is necessary as a basis for the effective application of what we commonly call scientific education. The program tells us in which direction education should move; it furnishes the standards or objectives by which we may be guided in the scientific determination of "immediate objectives"—*i.e.*, the objectives which serve as means for the realization of more ulterior ends.[7]

The position which Professor Bode assumes is that no scientific analysis known to man can determine the desirability or the need of anything. It can only marshal the facts on which a value-judgment may then be passed. This position is essentially shared by Professor Charters who states that "The philosopher sets up the aim, and the analyst provides only the technique for working the aim down into the terms of a curriculum.[8] That is, activity analysis does not determine objectives, but the objectives determine what sort of facts are needed in order that a program may be built. This whole position is admirably summed up by Robinson in the following quotation:

---

[7] Bode, Boyd H., *Modern Educational Theories*, pp. 345 and 347, The Macmillan Company, 1927.

[8] Charters, W. W., "Functional Analysis as the Basis for Curriculum Construction" in *Journal of Educational Research*, October, 1924.

> It is a fundamental and hopeful discovery, to be ranked among the great inventions of mankind, that we do not necessarily learn much about a situation from what is sometimes called a scientific method of dealing with it. We can fill a big book with statistical tables and imposing graphs, but so long as we do not ask how we got into the fix we miss the main point. When in the seventeenth century almost all educated men, doctors, theologians, jurists, professors, believed in witchcraft one might have prepared questionnaires and surveys to seek out and record the incidence of witchcraft, the frequency of the devil's "sabbaths," the technic of getting up a chimney on a broom or three-legged stool; the per cent of witches who sank when they were cast into the water, the average location of the devil's mark. But all this would hardly have forwarded the disappearance of the delusion.[9]

The position which has been assumed in the foregoing discussion is that in the determination of its ultimate objectives education is dependent upon processes of philosophical thought. This is perhaps even more true in the case of such a specialized field as religious education. A few considerations will make this clear. By the very fact of setting out to educate in religion we have already established a type of objective. Further, when we specify that this education shall be in the Christian religion, we have defined our objectives still more closely. No kind or amount of research could ever reveal that these are the particular objectives with which we

[9] Robinson, J. H., "How Did We Get That Way?" in *Harper's Magazine*, August, 1926, pp. 271, 272.

should start. The interpretation of the meaning of the Christian religion, while having certain historic bases, is again a matter of philosophical and theological thinking. Scientific analysis may reveal the present expression of religion in life, and the social conditions from which the need for religion may be inferred, but what it cannot do is to define what ought to be. When this ideal has been set up, scientific method can again proceed to determine procedures for the attainment of these goals.(But to set up any group of major objectives for religious education is a function which only philosophy can discharge.)

3. *Scientific method in determining specific objectives.* The foregoing discussion is not to be interpreted as maintaining that scientific method has no place in defining the objectives of religious education. Having once determined upon the major principles which we shall set out to achieve, we need then to invoke the scientific method in order to make these major principles concrete, quantitative, and immediate in terms of the present life experiences and needs of those who are to be educated. Not only should it be granted that scientific method will be an aid in this procedure, but beyond this, that only with the aid of scientific method can the task be carried out with any degree of adequacy.

The scientific approach to the defining of immediate or specific objectives in religious education will involve some form of study of society or of individual activities. The essence of this method is to go out to society and among people, to observe life as it is being lived and must be lived under contemporary environmental conditions, to analyze human activities, to discover the situations in which conduct difficulties occur, and from such data to interpret the specific meaning of the ultimate goals which have been set for religious education. Inglis [10] finds the key to an analysis of aims in education in an analysis of the activities of life in which people do or should engage. He maintains that aims must be interpreted in terms of activities in which individuals may be expected normally to participate. Weigle points out the necessity of a careful study of social problems of the present day if the general Christian objective is to be realized:

> And to apply Christianity to social problems of the present day demands, as an essential prerequisite, patient and skillful research. For although the Christian principles themselves are clear and simple, the application of them to many of the social and international questions of our time is extraordinarily difficult. The average Christian simply does not know enough about the economic structure of society or about the relations of nations to each other in the modern world to be able to

---

[10] Inglis, Alexander, *Principles of Secondary Education*, Houghton Mifflin Company.

> decide, in many concrete cases of industrial controversy or national policy, what will work most effectively toward the Christian goal. The spirit of good will, though absolutely basic and fundamental, is by itself not sufficient. There must also be a clear understanding of how that good will can be so applied practically as to secure the ends which Christians seek.[11]

That this method of investigation presents extraordinary difficulties is, according to Davis, due to the fact that "society is so complex in its organization, individuals are so sensitive and secretive about many of their most serious thoughts and deepest emotions, and the financial cost of any prolonged and careful observation and analysis of the world as it is, is so great, that any complete and thorough survey of humanity is impossible. Moreover, society is dynamic, not static. Consequently, any analysis that is made is only temporarily useful. The scenes shift so rapidly among mankind that any study of the actors involves a continuous refocusing of efforts and an endless reevaluation of data. And yet the scientific method demands precisely this procedure. Consequently, the task of curriculum building is a never-ending one." [12]

---

[11] *The Teaching Work of the Church*, pp. 55, 56, Association Press, 1923.

[12] Davis, C. A., *Our Evolving High School Curriculum*, pp. 79, 80, Copyright, 1927, by World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York.

It will be clear from this discussion that the emphasis which has been laid upon the philosophical determination of comprehensive objectives is important. Any study of society or of individual activities yields no clue as to the direction in which education should proceed unless there are some criteria by which to judge the value of things as they now are. Further, education is not simply an attempt to lead growing persons to do better the desirable activities which may be revealed by such a study, but also to reveal to them higher types of activities and to make these both desired and possible. If the general goal and direction of education is known, such a study of social conditions and individual needs and interests is fundamental in directing educational procedure toward the attainment of the goal which has been set up.

Harap[13] has classified the attempts which have been made at the scientific determination of curricula into nine general categories, as follows:

1. The method of analysis of the actual conditions of life. This may involve the investigation of activities, of difficulties, of interests, or any other approach through which the result may emerge in the form of needs on which objectives can be built.

---

[13] Harap, Henry, "A Critique of the Present Status of Curriculum-Making" in *School and Society*, vol. xxv, February 19, 1927, pp. 210-212.

2. The method of job analysis. This is primarily applied to discovering objectives of vocational education. It is similar to the method described under the first paragraph above, except that the field of study is narrowed to a given job of which analysis is made.

3. The method of analysis of a "case group." This assumes a more or less homogeneous group for which educational procedures are to be set up. The investigators will make a direct survey of the needs of a particular group. It is similar to the one described in the first paragraph above, except that the application is made to a limited group.

4. The method of analysis of newspapers and magazines. This is a direct analysis if the purpose is to determine what skills the individual needs for reading papers and magazines. If its purpose is to determine life needs in general the validity of the method is dependent upon the faithfulness with which newspapers and magazines mirror life.

5. The method of analysis of social statistics. Through such a study data may be made available which describe needs. This method has the advantage of greater ease of application over the method of direct study.

6. The method of analysis of the opinion of competent persons. The faithfulness with which this method represents actual needs depends upon the competence of the judges and their experience with actual life. It is possible that such method may result only in a consensus of prejudices.

7. The method of quantitative analysis of children's activities, interests, or questions. The assumption of this method is that the behavior of the child is the best guide to the most interesting and most useful school activities for children.

8. The method of analyzing project curricula. Such curricula, having grown out of the free activities and experiences of children, may thus be taken to reflect actual interests and needs.

9. The method of analyzing existing objectives. This is simply a critical evaluation of what has already been done and subject to such limitations as result from its lack of direct approach to life.

4. *An eclectic procedure.* Any analysis of approaches to the determination of objectives such as the two here summarized makes evident the fact that there is no best single approach to this problem. Without question, while these different approaches are of varying value, much good has come from each. If we should review the efforts to determine objectives in religious education we would have no difficulty in distinguishing clearly several distinct methods.

Let no advocate of one approach to the determination of objectives regard lightly what others are doing. No single approach has all the merit in its favor. There is much to be said for an *eclectic* policy of integrating the results from many approaches. It is only thus that each of the methods can render its best contribution to the whole. If this is done under careful guidance, a partial or negative result because of the inherent weaknesses of any particular method may be avoided. The exploration of the possibilities of various methods through which both comprehensive and specific objectives may be determined is essential to the development of religious education. The work which has been done in this field, while significant, is very meager compared with that which remains to be done.

PART TWO

A Study in Comprehensive Objectives

CHAPTER IV

NATURE AND SCOPE OF THIS STUDY

THUS far we have been concerned with a general theory of objectives. From this point forward we shall attempt to state in general outline a series of comprehensive objectives for religious education. These statements are based on a study recently completed by the author, involving an extensive review of the literature in religious education. In this chapter we shall give a brief description of the study itself, so that the reader may, with greater understanding and sympathy, enter into the discussions which follow. Before proceeding with the description of this study, we shall take a brief glance at what has previously been done in defining objectives.

1. *Current studies*. A search for printed reports of studies in the field of comprehensive objectives has revealed the fact that few studies have been made. The most comprehensive study which has been undertaken is that by Professor Adelaide Case, published under the title, *Liberal Christianity and*

Religious Education.[1] The present writer has participated in two previous studies in objectives, one of which has been published under the title, *The Areas of Human Experience*[2] and the other under the title, *Christian Character Traits.*[2]

The object of the study undertaken by Professor Case was to determine to what extent Protestant religious education has adopted the educational purposes implied in the liberal movement. The lines of investigation are five: (1) To discover the distinctive positions of liberal Christianity and from these to infer the educational objectives that are implied. (2) An examination of objectives as defined by leading writers in religious education and to determine the extent to which these leaders recognize and adopt the positions of liberal Christianity. (3) To inquire whether the objectives adopted by organizations of religious education represent adequately the principles implicit in the liberal movement. (4) To examine curriculum objectives to ascertain whether they show a recognition of the issues important for liberal Christianity and an attempt to meet them from the liberal point of view.

---

[1] The Macmillan Company, 1924.

[2] *The Development of a Curriculum of Religious Education,* Research Service Bulletin No. 5, The International Council of Religious Education, 1928. Appendices C and D.

(5) An inquiry into the competency of religious workers to deal with the objectives of liberal Christianity.

The fact that this study makes Christianity in the liberal sense a presupposition will necessarily yield but a partial view concerning objectives. The first three steps in Professor Case's procedure do, however, bear a relation to our present study, and will therefore be reviewed briefly.

The first part of the undertaking consists of an investigation of the recent writings of liberal Protestants. From this study there developed certain issues as central in liberal thought, and it is around these issues that the findings of the study are grouped. The issues are: I. The Bible; II. Theological Dogmas; III. The Historical Jesus; IV. Social Welfare; V. The Reconstruction of Society; VI. The Political State; VII. International and Interracial Problems; VIII. Human Nature; IX. The Educational Process; X. The Church. The position taken by the liberal writers on these issues were translated into educational objectives by the investigator. The following list of objectives resulted from this study:

1. A knowledge of the outstanding and widely accepted facts about the Bible as they are revealed by biblical research, with

specific information on important and much-discussed points in both the Old and the New Testament.

2. A scientific attitude toward the biblical records, toward nature, and toward the facts of Christian history.

3. The discovery of the character of Jesus and the nature of his teaching through a free and realistic approach to his life.

4. An acquaintance with the background that gave Christianity its setting, the surrounding cultures, and the history of the Christian movement.

5. An evaluation, on the basis of the ethics of Jesus, of biblical characters and incidents, religious ideas, and doctrinal statements.

6. An appreciation of the teachings of Jesus and a conscious attempt to make them effective in meeting the problems of present social life.

7. An effort to restate the "fundamentals" of Christianity in terms of ethical purpose and inclusive fellowship.

8. Knowledge of the facts of our present civilization—accurate information on living conditions, on social institutions, including the church and the state, and on the make-up of human nature.

9. The desire and the ability to relieve suffering and to work toward the reform of un-Christian social conditions.

10. An evaluation, on a Christian basis, of the institutions with which the groups under instruction come into contact, and active effort for whatever reconstructions are found to be needed.

11. Mutual appreciation and coöperation among groups where there are racial, occupational, national, or other differences; and the attempt to destroy "special privilege" due to age, sex, race, wealth, etc.

12. Activity in abolishing war as a means of settling disputes, and participation in efforts for reconciliation between individuals, classes, and nations.

13. Active faith in humanity and in the gradual transformation of society into what is commonly called "the kingdom of God." This is always taken to mean a brotherly society and usually involves the acceptance of a democratic ideal and experiments in democratic organization.

14. Efforts to develop the Christian church as an effective agency for the reconstruction of society.[8]

The second part of Professor Case's study passes in review six representative religious educators, and judges their position on the objectives of religious education in the light of the objectives derived from the study of the liberal Protestant writers. There is no indication of the basis on which these men are regarded to be "representative." Presumably they are of the author's own selection. No one will be inclined to raise any serious doubt, however, concerning the representative character of a list which includes the names of Weigle, Athearn, Betts, Hartshorne, Cope, and Coe. In the case of each author, not more than three quotations are exhibited to show his position. Each in turn is judged by the criteria set up in the first part of the study as the objectives of liberal Christian education.

The third section of the study deals with the stated objectives of organizations for religious education. These include both denominational and interdenominational organizations, a rather wide selection of both having been made. As might be expected, such statements are found to be exceedingly general and in most cases follow the more traditional terminology. The sum total of the result of this part of the investigation is to show that if liberal tendencies are to be introduced into the work promoted by these agencies, it will need to be in spite of, or at least without explicit sanction from, the stated objectives of such organizations.

---

[8] Case, Adelaide T., *Liberal Christianity and Religious Education*, pp. 36, 37, and 73, The Macmillan Company, 1924.

The chief value of Professor Case's study for our present purpose lies in the first section. The group of fourteen objectives which resulted from a study of the literature of liberal Christianity is very significant. There seem, however, to be some omissions which can hardly be explained on the basis of the limitation of the study to "liberal Christianity." One is forcibly struck with the fact that in the entire list there is no direct reference to worship or to the relation of the individual Christian to God.

The evaluation of the leaders in religious education as judged by their positions on these objectives can hardly be called valid because of the meagerness of the data presented. In the case of Weigle, for example, the investigator makes as a chief point of criticism the fact that his aims are stated in such general terms as to lack specific direction. Yet in another part of the same book from which one of the quotations is drawn, almost an entire chapter is given to a treatment of specific objectives.[4]

The study entitled *The Areas of Human Experience* was an attempt to analyze the total life process into its major divisions. Its purpose is to serve as an instrument of analysis and classification of the activities, interests, and problem-situations of growing persons. As such, it is a step toward the determination of specific objectives. Its function is to help relate the ideals and motives of the Christian religion to the whole of the learner's life.

The analysis was made from the standpoint of the individual and the group coming to active self-realization in the functions of life. It was prepared by the writer and a group of associates, and was then presented for review and criticism to the International Lesson Committee and its subcommittee dealing with the curriculum of religious education. More recently it has been adopted by the Educational Commission of the International Council of Religious Education as one of its curriculum instruments. The analysis may, therefore, be regarded as having been developed by the method of consensus judgment.

---

[4] Weigle, L. A., *The Pupil and the Teacher*, chap. xix. The United Lutheran Publication House, 1911.

In this analysis there are eleven major areas. Under each of these areas there are further subdivisions into the relations in which a person will stand in performing the activities of life. The subdivisions include: (1) personal, (2) home, (3) school, (4) church, (5) other community, (6) relations beyond the local community. It is the plan to carry this study further to include large numbers of activities, interests, problems, etc., under each of these areas, and for the several age groups of growing persons. It is from this detailed analysis of experience, set over against the objectives of religious education, that certain specific objectives will emerge. The eleven areas of experience are as follows:

I. *Health Activities*
  A. The activities concerned with the general well-being of the physical body—sanitation, food and drink, exercise, illness, etc.
  B. Mental hygiene. Activities concerned with building up wholesome attitudes toward oneself as a member of society; an understanding of prejudices, fears, secrecies in oneself and in others.

II. *Educational Activities*
  The activities concerned with mental efficiency—developing the native capacities; broad mental culture; etc.

III. *Economic Activities*
Business relations—the meaning and use of money; production and consumption.

IV. *Vocational Activities*
Activities growing out of one's life work—sharing in the obligations of the world's work, as well as its benefits; creative service and personal fulfillment through the labors of one's calling.

V. *Citizenship Activities*
Activities growing out of the governmental function which is necessary in every organized social group.

VI. *Recreation*
The use of leisure time—amusements, play, hobbies, reading, etc.

VII. *Parenthood and Family Life*
The instinct of sex and the function of reproduction as related to a Christian social order; the family as a social unit.

VIII. *General Life in the Group*
Contacts and relationships growing out of and consequent on living in social groups, as these are not covered in the other nine specialized areas.

IX. *Friendship Activities*
The more intimate human fellowship, cultivated for its own sake.

X. *Æsthetic Activities*
Appreciation and enjoyment of the beautiful.

XI. *Specialized Religious Activities*
Specifically religious activities, which form a part of most lives. Not a negation of religious content in the

other ten areas, but an affirmation that there is an area of experience concerned with the more or less formal religious act.

This study represents a contribution toward a technique for the determination of objectives in religious education. Except in Area XI, however, it bears no specifically religious content. It is based on the assumption that religion is a potential quality of all individual and social living, and offers a technique for controlling the activities in the various areas of life in terms of a Christian interpretation. In other words, it assumes that certain ultimate values of religion will be set over against the results from this analysis before truly Christian objectives can result from this technique.

The study entitled *Christian Character Traits* was prepared with a view to making more explicit the general term "Christian character." In the total concept of "Christian character" there are qualities which are commonly lifted out and spoken of separately in describing an individual or his conduct. Thus we say of a man that he is "honest" or "loyal" or "reverent," and describe his conduct as "honesty" or "loyalty" or "reverence." That is, there are groups of similar situations to which a given type of outcome has best served the welfare of both the individual and society. This type of outcome has been labeled "honesty," "loyalty," etc., as the case may be. When an individual possesses the quality of character which leads him habitually to respond in this manner, we call it a "trait" of his character.

The list of traits resulting from this study emphasizes in the main the basic virtues of all moral living. In most cases the trait name does not indicate any specific religious quality except as the Christian religion is united in its purpose with the moral ideal. According to the statement accompanying this study, in a program of Christian education these basic traits will be lifted to consciousness as ways of working with God in building his kingdom, and will thus be permeated through and through with religious meaning. It is recognized that there is no sharp line of demarcation between traits, and that constant attention must be given to the integration of all into a unified personality. Further, these are general terms which cannot be taught in the abstract, but will come to realization in character only as the result of indefinitely many specific responses.

But one example is here given of the way in which each of the traits resulting from this study was stated:

FAITH No. 5

	Positive Elaboration
Adventurousness Assurance Belief Confidence Hopefulness Trust	Unworried trust in God as the perfect Father; Acceptance of Christ as Saviour and his way of Life; Coöperation with Christ in the progressive realization of the Kingdom; Trust in the faithfulness and good will of others; Willingness to trust the untried faith in others as a dynamic in personal and social living; Confidence in one's self;
	Negative Elaboration
Anxiety Distrust Doubt Self-distrust Suspicion Worry	Lack of trust in God; Lack of confidence in one's own ability; Mistrust and suspicion of others;

The total number of traits in the list as it was finally developed is twenty-two, as follows:

Cooperation
Courage
Creativeness
Dependability
Faith
Forgiveness
Good will
Health-mindedness
Honesty
Humility
Joyousness
Love

Loyalty
Obedience
Open-mindedness
Penitence
Purity
Purposefulness
Reverence
Self-control
Self-respect
Spirituality

2. *Method of study*. We are now ready to proceed with the description of the study in objectives on which the remainder of this book is based. We shall give such details only as will help the reader in understanding and evaluating the chapters which are to follow. Anyone interested in reviewing the study in detail may find a complete report on file in the Library of Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, under the title *A Critical Study of Objectives in Religious Education.*

The underlying consideration on which this study is based may be summarized as follows:

(1) The time has arrived in the development of religious education when an effort should be made to formulate and summarize the best thinking concerning its fundamental aims. Such formulation should be made with a view to providing a point of departure for a new impetus and development of constructive thought, and should be regarded as in no sense a finally completed statement. We must promote above all things a continuance of the healthy growth which characterizes a movement in

its youth, and avoid the too-early crystallization of what is by accepting it as what ought to be.

(2) The first step in defining objectives is that of setting out the comprehensive aims which indicate the major purpose of the movement. With these as points of orientation, the more specific objectives may then be formulated. This formulation of specific objectives may be approached through analysis of the comprehensive statements, on the one hand, and through research in the actual experience of growing persons, on the other.

(3) We are not starting *de novo*, but have a quarter-century of history in religious education on which to make a beginning, during which a considerable literature has been produced. We have not been without our prophets. Those who have been giving their lives to this movement have been striving toward certain great ideals as their objectives. If we may bring together the combined wisdom represented by these leaders, we will undoubtedly have a valuable body of data toward the determination of the objectives of religious education. It is, therefore, with the writings of the leading thinkers in religious education that we shall make our beginning.

We are not attempting to arrive at a cross section of opinion. Rather are we concerned with the expressed opinion of those who by their influence are entitled to be classified as leaders of thought in the movement—the philosophers to whom the shaping of the movement has been due. This lays upon us the obligation of selecting a group of leaders whose writings should be reviewed. Professor Betts once made the statement that "in almost any particular field, except perhaps fiction, half a dozen or ten writers (the best half-dozen or ten) say all that the others say." With this consideration in mind it has seemed to us that a review of the writings of the ten persons who might be ranked highest as leaders in religious education would give us a satisfactory survey of the views in this field.

While it would not be difficult to name a group of leaders in religious education who would be generally accepted as such, it was decided that for the sake of greater objectivity it would be best to submit the problem of selecting leaders to a referendum of persons who are in a position to know the literature of religious education fairly intimately. Consequently, the question was passed on to 213 professors of religious education in seminaries and colleges, asking each to name the ten persons whom he considered to be the foremost leaders in religious education. Eighty-four replies were received, and on the basis of these replies the following list of names was accepted as constituting the ten leaders whose writings were to be studied:

Joseph Manson Artman
Walter Scott Athearn
George Herbert Betts
William Clayton Bower
George Albert Coe
Henry Frederick Cope
Hugh Hartshorne
Norman Egbert Richardson
Theodore Gerald Soares
Luther Allan Weigle

All the writings of these men published as books, and all their writings in periodicals appearing during or after 1916, were included as part of this study. The complete bibliography appears in Appendix I.

In addition to the writings of religious educators, it was thought advisable to review the utterances dealing with religious education of leaders in the field of general education. In selecting such leaders the same method of consensus judgment might have been used, but it was recognized that with so many more men and women who have risen to a position of prominence in this field it would be much more difficult to employ this method. Consequently, the simpler plan was used of accepting the Committee on Curriculum which was appointed by the National Society for the Study of Education and which prepared the *Twenty-sixth Yearbook* of the society as the group whose writings should be studied. It is not claimed that this list of men would be accepted by everyone as those in general education who are most competent to speak concerning the aim and purpose of religious education. It is assumed, however, that appointment to this important committee does signify a position of leadership. The members of the committee were as follows:

William C. Bagley
Franklin Bobbitt
Frederick G. Bonser
Werrett W. Charters
George S. Counts
Stuart A. Courtis
Ernest Horn
Charles H. Judd
Frederick J. Kelly
William H. Kilpatrick
Harold Rugg
George A. Works

In the case of this group of public-school men it was recognized that only a small per cent of their writings would touch religious education. Instead of reviewing all their writings, therefore, each man was approached by letter and requested to name the sources which should be reviewed for his position on religious education. On the basis of the replies received it was found that only four laid claim to having expressed themselves at any place concerning religious education. These four were Bobbitt, Bonser, Counts, and Kilpatrick. In each case the material on religious education was limited to a single title.

It is surprising to find that so little attention has been paid to religious education by those who are the leaders in America's great system of public schools. The dearth of writings on religious education from the pens of public educators shows a corresponding failure to grapple with the problems of a complete education which includes education in religion as an integral part. Both general education and religious education await for their future growth the development of a philosophy of education which shall take adequate account of their interrelatedness.

A third source utilized in this study was the statements of objectives of religious education made by organizations for the promotion of religious education. Approach was made to the boards of religious education of the various denominations having membership in the International Council of Religious Education, and to such interdenominational and nondenominational organizations as have for their purpose the promotion of religious education. Only the International Council of Religious Education and the International Missionary Council furnished source materials in addition to the denominational boards. The material in this field was found to be exceedingly limited and characterized by a lack of definiteness. In almost no case could the stated objectives be regarded as having more than a very general value. In most cases the program of the organization has developed far beyond its statement of aim. Most of the statements were found to be conservative from an educational viewpoint, indicating a marked bias toward education as indoctrination rather than education as growth of the free spirit of the persons to be educated. The review of these source materials, showing the inadequacy of such statements of objectives, has but reëmphasized the need for such a study as we are here describing.

3. *Method of handling sources.* The approach to the study of source materials was made by the inductive method. All the source materials were read, and selection made of all passages which might be interpreted as an expression of the author's view on the aim and purpose of religious education. The temptingly easy method of asking each author to indicate where his statements of objectives might be found was rejected because it was our purpose to include all utterances on objectives, whether made directly or indirectly. Some of the most significant contributions to our study were found, not in the cautiously formulated, categorical statements of objectives, but in the exposition of some position into which the author threw his whole heart and soul, without thought of formulating a generally accept-

able and valid statement of purpose in the language of an objective.

After the selection of quotations had been made, these were arranged for each author under a few major categories. These individual groupings were then telescoped into one master list of objectives.

4. *A referendum on objectives.* Having developed the list of objectives as found in the literature on religious education, the next step provided for a test to determine the extent to which these objectives are held by those who are engaged in the actual performance of the work of religious education. It was not the purpose of this referendum to determine by popular vote what the objectives of religious education should be. It was recognized from the beginning, however, that such popular review of the objectives would, without doubt, yield valuable data by way of criticism of the list already formulated.

The purpose of this referendum may be stated as (1) to test those who are most closely related to religious education today—both professionally and semi-professionally—by these statements of objectives derived from the leaders, to see to what extent the vision of the leaders has become effective in practice; (2) to test the objectives themselves, derived from the vision of the leaders, to determine the extent to which those who are actually engaged in the process of religious education find such statements of purpose practical and usable; (3) to provide data for the investigator's own review, critique, and revision of the statement of objectives thus far derived.

A questionnaire was prepared by means of which each item in the list of objectives might be evaluated. It was requested that each respondent evaluate each item on a five-point scale, ranging from essential to undesirable. This questionnaire was sent to 434 persons who are in a position to know religious education sufficiently intimately to express a valid opinion. The list included teachers (professional) of religious education, promotional leaders, directors in local churches, ministers, college presidents, and leaders in general education. Fifty-eight per cent of those addressed responded on the questionnaire.

On the whole, the tabulation of the results from this referendum revealed a surprising amount of agreement with the objectives as stated. Many not only declared themselves to be in favor of these statements, but expressed great satisfaction with them. This general agreement with these objectives is remarkable when we call to mind the fact that among the respondents were persons of all shades of religious and educational views. From the results of this referendum we would draw the following conclusions: (1) That the ideals of the leaders in the profession have, with a fair degree of effectiveness, taken hold on the rank and file of professional workers, and (2) that these ideals have been found workable and possible of application by these workers. We should not, however, be unmindful of the fact that in any questionnaire such as this there is a large amount of suggestion which would lead the respondent to make a favorable response if he had no conviction of his own, and the further fact that comprehensive objectives must, in the nature of the case, be stated in such general terms that it becomes rather easy to give assent to them. Even with proper discount made for these considerations, the above conclusions seem amply justified.

The suggestions which were made by many of the respondents to this questionnaire led to certain desirable revisions in the statements of objectives which had originally been made. After all revisions had been made, the resulting list of comprehensive objectives consisted of seven major categories with a number of subdivisions under each.

CHAPTER V

WHAT, THEN, ARE THE OBJECTIVES?

OUR study in objectives has yielded a list of seven major statements, each with a group of subdivisions. Each of these seven major categories will form the subject of one of the following seven chapters. Before proceeding to this more detailed consideration, it will help the reader to see the entire list of objectives at a glance. We shall anticipate our findings, therefore, and present here the entire framework on which the next seven chapters are built.

Following this presentation we shall make a few comments concerning the findings which may help the reader to understand and evaluate what is to follow. Each of the seven major statements will be repeated as sub-titles for the seven chapters which immediately follow. The sub-points under each of the major categories will be repeated as chapter sub-divisions.

OBJECTIVES IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION[1]

I. To foster in growing persons a consciousness of God as a reality in human experience, and a sense of personal relationship to him.

1. To guide growing persons in the discovery of God through his revelation of himself in nature, in the Bible, in Jesus Christ, and in human experience and achievement; a continuous enlargement of discovery through the learner's changing experience and increasing ability to apprehend.

   Recognizing freely the impossibility of fully representing God to the human intelligence, we must yet start the learner on his own discovery of him. God's part of the process is revelation, man's part that of discovery.

2. To guide growing persons into the development of a growing faith in God based on an increasing experience of conviction of the reality and truth of his being, character, and purpose.

   An experience of faith, going beyond the mental appropriation of knowledge about God, to the conviction of its truth, and the shaping of life and conduct in harmony therewith.

3. To guide growing persons to respond to the experience of faith in the character and purpose of

---

[1] This summary is essentially the same as the statement of objectives adopted by the International Council of Religious Education, and printed in a bulletin entitled *The Development of a Curriculum of Religious Education.* That statement was itself derived from the author's study described in these pages.

God with such attitudes toward him as dependence, trust, obedience, gratitude, and submission to his will.

The father-child relationship to God, with its implications in personal attitudes.

4. To develop in growing persons the practice of communion with God through worship.

   The natural response to a consciousness of divine-human relationship, both individual and group; an experience which has worth both for its own sake and as a dynamic for sharing in God's work for the world.

5. To guide growing persons in finding God increasingly through service with and for men and an experience of harmony and fellowship with him through participation in his purpose.

   True Christian experience through the socializing of the will; consciousness of membership in a social group of which God is a part; the discovery of God in the midst of the processes of life.

6. To assist growing persons increasingly to control personal and social conduct in the light of God's relation to the world, and faith in the validity of the eternal principles of right and justice on which right living is based.

   The acceptance of the divine Fatherhood, with all its implications, carried into the relations of life; recognition that religious living is concerned with all the relations and functions of life; eternal principles of right conduct, rooted in the constitution of the universe itself, as the expression of the nature and will of God.

II. To lead growing persons into an understanding and appreciation of the personality, life, and teaching of Jesus Christ.

1. To lead growing persons to discover in Jesus Christ the highest moral and religious ideal.

   The discovery of Jesus as Saviour and Lord; at one with him in his spirit, purpose, and work; finding the Father through his example and teaching.

2. To guide growing persons to a discovery of Jesus Christ as the true revelation of God.

   A faith that God is Christlike, and an experience of finding God through Jesus' teaching and example.

3. To assist growing persons to discover in Jesus one in and through whom fullness of life is found, and who challenges loyalty to his personality and work.

   Jesus as the criterion of social and moral worth; as an example of highest religious adjustment; as a guide to Christlike reactions to the situations of the present day.

III. To foster in growing persons a progressive and continuous development of Christlike character.

1. To promote continuous growth.

   The capacity for and achievement of continuous reconstruction of experience; growth into an increasing capacity to grow; progressive development toward the fullest possible self-realization.

2. To lead growing persons to an understanding of the nature and meaning of sin, and to an experience of reëducation and recovery from sin.

   Christianity as a religion of redemption as well as a religion of development; education in the meaning of sin and in the means of recovery from sin.

3. To guide growing persons in the achievement of personal religious experience.

   Christianity as a religion of experience; fostering the regenerating life of God in the soul of man; education as the human process whereby each individual may be brought to the fullest experience of God in his life.

4. To lead growing persons to the discovery and use of the spiritual techniques through which may be realized the highest religious adjustment.

   Religious education meeting its responsibility for giving the growing person the means whereby he may most fully realize his religious adjustment.

5. To develop in growing persons an increasing ability of self-direction and self-control in moral and religious situations.

   Basing conduct on insight and understanding and the person's own free choices; readiness to adjust to changing situations and circumstances; ability to stand on one's own feet in making moral and religious adjustments.

6. To lead growing persons into the actual experience of Christian living.

   Character as a Christian way of reacting to life situations; education through guidance of the learner in making Christlike responses to actual situations of many types; a continuous reconstruction of experience in the light of growing Christian purposes and insight.

7. To guide growing persons in the achievement of an articulate expression of a developing personal faith.

   The necessity for adherence to some belief; religious education seeking to make belief Christian and to bring it to articulate expression.

8. To guide growing persons into creative living and a forward-looking faith.

   A sensitiveness to higher values; a forward-looking attitude toward truth and open-mindedness to new truth; interest in and a constructive attitude toward the discovery of God's laws for the world, man, and society.

9. To guide growing persons to self-realization through choice of and service in vocations, on the basis of Christian principles.

   Religion as permeating the whole of life; vocation as an opportunity for making spiritual ideals and principles effective.

10. To develop in growing persons the ability and disposition to take responsibility for leadership in Christian service.

    Active performance of Christlike deeds wherever opportunity affords; assisting others in making a full consideration of the acceptance of Jesus' way of living.

11. To cultivate in growing persons the ability and

disposition to follow the guidance of spiritual leaders.

Responsiveness to the men of spiritual vision who by experience and training are worthy to lead; not a blind following, but a following on recognition of merit.

IV. To develop in growing persons the ability and disposition to participate in and contribute constructively to the building of a social order embodying the ideal of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

1. To lead growing persons to reverence and respect the personalities of other human beings.

   Attitude of respect and love toward others; respect for differing viewpoints; recognition of the implications of brotherhood under the common fatherhood of God.

2. To guide growing persons in the interpretation of life in the social order in terms of religious ideals.

   Recognition of the social implications of the Christian gospel; the responsibility of every member of a group for the well-being of that group; seeking to work with God in the doing of his work in the advancement of social righteousness.

3. To develop in growing persons the ability and disposition to participate in the life of society under Christian ideals.

   Responsibility for right conduct in the social order in which the learner is now placed; active participation in making it more ideal.

4. To guide growing persons to whole-hearted participation in bringing about constructive advancement toward the ideal of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

   Constructive criticism of the present social order with a view to improvement; willingness to follow out the implications of love; acceptance of responsibility to promote changes toward the coming of the kingdom.

5. To develop in growing persons that large-group consciousness which includes in its scope the entire human family.

   Obedience to the Christian message that the love of God extends to all his people; the principles of brotherhood applied throughout the entire Christian family.

2. *V. To lead growing persons to build a life philosophy on the basis of a Christian interpretation of life and the universe.*

1. To guide growing persons in the interpretation of the universe in the light of their faith in the power and purpose of God.

   Recognition of the presence and power of God in the world of nature.

2. To lead growing persons to the achievement of a faith in the validity and ultimate conservation of life's highest values.

   A constructive faith that ideals are eternally valid; conservation of the highest values; Christian interpretation of the problem of evil.

3. To guide growing persons in the discovery and adoption of a Christian interpretation of the problem of continuity of personality in life after the death of the physical body.

   Life after death as a factor in Christian faith; a Christian interpretation of the problem of the ultimate conservation of values.

VI. *To develop in growing persons the ability and disposition to participate in the organized society of Christians—the church.*

1. To guide growing persons into intelligent, active, and efficient membership in the Christian church.

   The church as the organized expression of Christianity; adequate preparation for worthy membership in this organization.

2. To guide growing persons into whole-hearted participation in constructive Christian service in and through the channels of the church.

   Religious education in its responsibility for developing the efficient Christian and the outgoing church; the church as an avenue for Christian service.

3. To develop in growing persons the ability and disposition to make a constructive contribution to the progressive realization of a church which expresses more and more perfectly the Christian concept of the will and purpose of God for the world.

   The church in process of continual reconstruction to meet the needs of a changing world; the ability and disposition on the part of every Christian to share constructively in developing the life of the church.

VII. *To effect in growing persons the assimilation of the best religious experience of the race, as effective guidance to present experience.*

1. To lead growing persons to a knowledge and an appreciation of the Bible.

   The Bible as a record of developing religious experience; its meaning for the life of today.

2. To lead growing persons to a familiarity with the best Christian thought as a stimulus and guide toward a developing faith.

   Assimilation of the best thought of men in seeking to interpret God and the religious experience; guidance through the world's moral leaders.

3. To lead growing persons into a sympathetic appreciation of the best thought and ideas in other faiths.

   Fair-mindedness toward the best in thought and experience of all religions; seeing in the religious experience of the world a common struggle toward an apprehension of God and the ideal way of life.

4. To lead growing persons to an acquaintance with and appreciation of religious culture as recorded in the fine arts.

   Other elements in the religious heritage of the race; the fine arts as an expression of man's religious aspirations, and as an aid to religious experience.

In the main, these seven major objectives are each but a different way of looking at the aim and purpose of religious education. Some will wish to lay greater stress on one, some on another. It is conceivable that a person might start with any one of these major objectives and by developing it in all of its ramifications attain the values represented by all. On the other hand, it is our conviction that greater progress will be made if we approach religious education from various angles. When care is taken that the activities developed under each of these objectives merge into one integrated and comprehensive whole, we cannot but benefit by making many approaches.

It is the conviction of the author that the sixth and seventh major objectives are on a lower plane of importance than the remaining five. They are more in the nature of "mediate" objectives, because they are instrumental to some more ultimate value which lies beyond. Efficient membership in the church obviously is mediate to the purpose and work for which the church is maintained. Assimilation of the religious heritage of the race is mediate to the personal and social values which are to be derived therefrom. Nevertheless, it has seemed best to include these two objectives as major categories, and for three reasons: (1) They receive sufficient attention in the literature of religious education to deserve a place in the primary list; (2) They bear almost an essential relationship to the personal and social values which may be regarded as ultimate objectives; (3) If education in churchmanship and education in the religious culture of the race are to receive recognition and adequate emphasis we must look to the school of religious education to include them in its scope. There is no other institution which can render this service.

Each of these seven major categories is of sufficient importance to justify a volume by itself, if it were to be properly treated as to meaning and the technique whereby it might be achieved. We must satisfy ourselves, however, with a brief indication of the direction in which the development of that objective will lie. It is perhaps unnecessary to point out that even though he were inclined to do so, no single author could adequately treat each of these seven major objectives. Such an undertaking involves a task in the performance of which workers from many fields must share. The theologian, the biblical scholar, the sociologist, the psychologist, the philosopher, and many others must bring the treasures of knowledge and insight which their labors have served to uncover. A mere reading of the list of objectives given above will indicate that in their ramifications they touch almost every field of human interest and knowledge. This is as it should be, for religion which has a worth-while value for human life must permeate every sphere in which man lives and moves.

1. *Just what has been accomplished through this study?* Before the reader proceeds to examine the more detailed considerations of these objectives which follow, let us make a brief preliminary evaluation.

(1) We would emphasize, in the first place, that this is but a beginning in a field which will require very extended investigation and experimentation. We are under no misapprehension as to the difficulty of the task of beginning a movement for the systematic formulation of objectives in religious education. Nevertheless, the beginning must be made. Having once made a beginning, it should become comparatively easy to make advances over the results of that effort. Without doubt the work here presented will appear very inadequate in a very short time. If, however, it serves as a springboard to launch new studies through which a more satisfactory statement of objectives may be formulated, it has served its purpose.

(2) We would emphasize, in the second place, that the statements of objectives here made are

based upon a study of the writings of many men. No claim to originality can be made by the author except in so far as original work has been done in classifying and interpreting. In many cases the interpretation of the author will be but a new statement of the position already assumed by other writers in this field. Wherever possible, the exact quotations expressing a given viewpoint have been used. This will make these pages more tedious reading than would be the case if fewer quotations were presented, but it will, on the other hand, reward the reader by inducting him more fully into the sources. The selection of sources is open to all the fallacies of human judgment. While every effort was made to include the most important statements from the leaders in religious education to support and illustrate each objective, it is not at all certain that all the most important utterances of each leader have been employed.

(3) In the third place, we must relieve the leaders in religious education whose writings are reviewed in this study from any responsibility for the viewpoints expressed, except in their direct quotations. Every precaution possible was taken to represent accurately the viewpoints of these leaders. After the selections and classifications of quotations had been made, the resulting exhibit was sent for

approval to the leader in question, and in most cases such approval was secured. Nevertheless, we are conscious of the fact that a single quotation used in support of a viewpoint, when it is removed from its context, may not adequately represent its writer on that particular viewpoint. Moreover, any classification of more or less random writings must lay upon the person making the classification the responsibility for giving an interpretation in one direction or another which may not have been intended by the writer. We should maintain, therefore, that the author of these pages must bear sole responsibility for the interpretations here made. The statements presented should not be labeled, "The objectives of religious education according to a group of leaders in religious education and in general education," but rather "The objectives of religious education *as stated by the investigator* in the light of his study of the writings on religious education by a group of leaders in religious education and in general education."

2. *Is this an adequate statement of objectives?* We have stated our purpose to be that of defining "comprehensive" objectives as distinct from specific objectives. We have attempted to state these comprehensive objectives so far as possible in sufficient detail to assure their serving as guidance to educa-

tional procedure. This has involved analysis, and any kind of analysis is open to certain weaknesses. The seven major objectives are not mutually exclusive, but represent different aspects of an educational purpose which must have fundamental unity. The same is true of the subdivisions under each of the seven objectives. On the other hand, the parts are never fully descriptive of the whole out of which they have been analyzed. There is a certain plus element which is lost through analysis. Nevertheless, religious education has so long been handicapped by statements of objectives which are too general to be practically useful, that we submit this analysis in spite of the risk of misinterpretation.

This statement of objectives represents the author's interpretation of the purpose of religious education in the light of his studies in the literature on the subject. Whether it will be found to be adequate by any other person, including the leaders in religious education from whom the content for this statement was derived, is of course an open question. We are dealing in a realm which is too subjective for us to speak with authority for anyone else. If, as we have maintained, the process of defining comprehensive objectives depends on philosophical thought, who shall say when a new prophet may arise and declare new objectives, or deny the validity of any of those at present included. Even before this statement of objectives is published there will no doubt be those who will advocate other values not here included.

It was no part of the author's plan to make a statement of objectives which should have finality in any sense of the term. It is probable that he himself will be quite dissatisfied with the statement and prepared to undertake a revision very soon after it is published. The only thing which is claimed for the present list is that it is the most complete statement of objectives which is at the present time available.

One of the chief considerations which would lead one to speak with hesitation regarding the finality of any list of objectives is the extreme ease with which the number of items can be changed by a different plan of organization. Further, the mythical border line between comprehensive and specific objectives is so mobile that the question might readily be raised at almost any time with respect to a given item whether it should go in or out of the list proposed. Finally, the generality of the statements themselves make it exceedingly difficult to draw the line on what they include—that is, it becomes a matter of interpretation whether any additional concepts be considered as covered by the statements already made, or whether they should be added as new items. This is an unavoidable result of dealing with objectives from the comprehensive point of view.

3. *Is this statement of objectives usable?* In answer to this question we shall have to ask further—usable for what? Let us recognize these statements for what they are and not expect them to perform a service which goes beyond their function.

As we have conceived it, the function of comprehensive objectives is to set the general purpose of the process. These goals, toward the accomplishment of which the process itself is instituted, are the lodestars by which the educational bark may steer its proper course. As points of orientation from which the departure may be made in defining specific objectives in much greater detail, and as criteria by which to judge the validity of any undertaking in defining specific objectives, these comprehensive objectives should be useful.

A further question concerning the usability of any statement of objectives is whether it serves to release activity for better religious educational procedure. Unless our statement does this it has failed in its purpose.

The effectiveness of the influence of these statements of objectives on educational practice will of course depend on the extent to which they are in harmony with the best educational principles. The basic assumptions which underlie our work may be briefly summarized as follows: Education is a process of growth. Growth is conceived, however, as being toward some goal. These goals are stated as objectives. Each growing person is to be free to form his own purposes, but maturity owes something by way of guidance in this process through the means and instruments which it possesses by the very fact of being mature. It is assumed that there is a possibility of rapport between the individual and God, and that even more than the individual reaches out for God, God is seeking to touch the soul of the individual. This experiential basis for religion is taken to be a fundamental criterion of success in religious education. It is assumed further, however, that God may work through natural process to attain his ends, and that, therefore, education is not a substitute for religious experience but the instrument for the promotion of such experience. The individual is regarded as the primary unit in the educational process, and all statements of objectives are made in terms of desired changes in persons.

CHAPTER VI

GOD-RELATIONSHIP AS OBJECTIVE

To foster in growing persons a consciousness of God as a reality in human experience, and a sense of personal relationship to him.

THE distinguishing mark of a religious experience is its recognized bearing on the relationship set up between the individual and God. No human interest or value can be regarded as lying outside the realm of possible religious significance and meaning. No human experience may, therefore, be regarded as foreign to the scope of religious education. Conversely, "education becomes religious when it is conscious of the presence, power, and love of God as the ultimate condition and supreme motive of human life, which includes and integrates all lesser values and motives whose proximate end is some form of human welfare." [1] Through religious education we must seek to recreate this consciousness of God in the experience of those whom we teach. Coe says of this central place of God in religious education:

---

[1] Weigle, Luther A., "What Makes Education Religious?" in *Religious Education,* April, 1923, p. 91.

> Into the constitution of every one of us God has wrought his plan for human life. In every genuine utterance of the religious impulse there is manifested "prevenient grace," the divine empowering and inspiration that "come before" our human acts and give them effect. Thus, at every step in religious education, God himself—the present, living God, the Word that enlighteneth every man coming into the world—is the supreme factor.[2]

The final goal of religious education is spiritual. It must lift experience to the level where it gets its meaning from a vivid sense of relation to God. It must train growing persons in the art of living as children of God. It must bring them to the realization of the divine likeness in themselves and the divine will in the social order.

> Religious education seeks to complete the educative process, beginning where secular education ends. . . . It seeks to secure a religious adjustment of the child to his whole environment, including God.[3]

It means that each individual person must rediscover God in his own life experience as the race has discovered him in its evolution upward. It means that religion, which had its origin in life itself, must be *built back into life,* into life in the shop and market place, life in the home and at school, life at work and at play, life at its fullest and tensest and best.[4]

---

[2] Coe, George A., *Education in Religion and Morals,* p. 38, Fleming H. Revell, 1904.

[3] Bower, W. C., *A Survey of Religious Education in the Local Church,* p. 63, Reprinted by permission of the University of Chicago Press, 1919.

Religious education must do more than simply teach about God. The term "religious" is not a name for a quality which is tacked on to experience, but a permeating and conditioning factor in every adjustment to nature and man, for when experience is lifted to the level of the religious, it becomes a sharing of God's purpose in the world. It is the great task of religious education to train growing persons in an increasing ability and readiness to interpret and control experience in terms of the character and purpose of God.

Let us not think of this process, however, as one operating in one direction only. While we are using such means as education places at our disposal to help the child to a spiritual experience of God, we may depend with confidence on the grace of God to reach out and touch the life of the child. The one process is that of human ministry to facilitate the child's apprehension of God; the other is the divine reality reaching out for that which is his own. "Religious education seeks to release, to liberate, to free the life of the living God in the soul of man. Religious education can direct man to his one and only vocation—the creative living of the good life."[5] Both the human and the divine influences are parts in the child's educative experience, for: "If God is the supreme educator of the race, he is for the same reason the supreme educator of each child. . . . Education has been persistently thought of as something done for the child by his elders, while the possibility that it may consist still more in something wrought within the character by the Divine Spirit has been scarcely dreamed of."[6]

---

[4] From *The Curriculum of Religious Education,* p. 204, by George H. Betts. Copyright 1924. Used by permission of The Abingdon Press.

This general viewpoint of God-relationship as an objective in religious education is admirably summarized in the following quotations:

> Religious education takes the child, endowed through his original nature as he is with capacities both for evil and good, and seeks to stimulate the good and suppress the bad, using for this purpose religious instruction, nurture, and guidance. Far from discarding or disregarding the supernatural factor, the working of the "grace of God," religious education believes so thoroughly in this factor that its great aim is to keep the bond between the child and his heavenly Father from ever being weakened or broken. It seeks so to train the child and stimulate and guide his spiritual development that this divine grace shall have constant access to the heart and life, a sustaining, organizing, upbuilding power acting continuously upon the

---

[5] Artman, Joseph M., "What Can Religious Education Do with Human Nature?" in *Religious Education*, April, 1923, p. 80.

[6] Coe, George A., *Education in Religion and Morals*, pp. 36, 37, Fleming H. Revell, 1904.

soul, rather than expecting it to reclaim a sin-sick soul which has lost its way.[7]

The supreme function of religious education is to develop a growing consciousness of God and of personal relation to Him, to reveal the meaning of the universe in terms of the character and purpose of God, and to lift into consciousness the principles upon which all right living is based and thus to help persons in their individual and social relationships to find the religious interpretation of experience and to carry this back as a motive into all activities.[8]

The second purpose of religious education is to develop a helpful and satisfying conception of God. To be helpful and satisfying, such a conception must include the recognition of a supreme creative energy or power in and through the universe, and a sense of being in actual or potential communication with this source of power. That this power is operative for good to the degree that man understands it and acts in harmony with it seems to be true. That man can so order his thoughts and feelings that he derives strength and clearness of vision by communion with this power as it permeates his being seems also to be true. To develop the capacity and attitude to recognize God and to communicate with him is what we mean by the growth of spiritual life.[9]

1. *To guide growing persons in the discovery of God through his revelation of himself in nature, in*

---

[7] From *The New Program of Religious Education*, p. 40, by George H. Betts. Copyright, 1921. Used by permission of the Abingdon Press.

[8] *The Development of a Curriculum of Religious Education, Research Service Bulletin* No. 5, p. 41, International Council of Religious Education, 1928.

[9] From the Introduction, by Frederick G. Bonser, to *The Golden Rule City*, p. vii, by Edna Madison Bonser. Copyright, 1927. Used by permission of The Pilgrim Press.

the Bible, in Jesus Christ, and in human experience and achievement; a continuous enlargement of discovery through the learner's changing experience and increasing ability to apprehend. In fostering this God relationship, religious education faces first of all the task of assisting the child in making his discovery of God. This apprehension of the divine must be thought of in terms of the learner's changing experience and increasing abilities. God has not left himself without witnesses, and Christian faith has always taken a positive stand on the accessibility of him to those who diligently seek.

Perhaps at no point in experience do individual differences come to the surface so clearly as in man's approach to God. On the one hand we have the pronounced mystic, who finds it entirely feasible through appropriate spiritual exercises to hold direct communion with God. While it is admitted that such profound mystical vision is denied to the great majority of men, there are many Christian leaders who maintain that in its milder forms direct mystical communion is entirely possible for anyone. Macintosh [10] takes the position that, as a certain scientific result may be had by fulfilling the proper conditions, just as surely may a spiritual result be attained by fulfilling certain conditions of the right religious adjustment. Soares offers as one of the aims of religious education, "Personal experience of rapport with the Eternal that may give the highest meaning to personal life as worthful in itself and in its contribution to social ends." [11] Richardson finds that "The practice of the presence of God is (for many persons) a wholesome, natural exercise. Meditation and introspection (in which the mind is orientated with reference to God) are frequent. There is a longing for personal fellowship with God. Original, first-hand, immediate awareness of his presence brings supreme satisfaction." [12]

---

[10] Macintosh, D. C., *Theology as an Empirical Science,* chap. v, The Macmillan Company.

At the other extreme we find persons who seem to have no place in their experience for mystical communion with God, but who find God in no less real sense as they contemplate his wondrous works and participate in his purposes for the world. It behooves us to respect the experience of both groups. The experience of the vast majority will lie at some point between the two extremes. In many persons both types of apprehension of God will be found. Let each in his own way draw near.

---

[11] Soares, Theodore Gerald, *Religious Education,* p. xviii. Reprinted by permission of The University of Chicago Press, 1928.

[12] From *The Religious Education of Adolescents,* by Norman E. Richardson, p. 167. Copyright, 1918. Used by permission of The Abingdon Press.

Religious educators are agreed on the primary importance of leading the child into his own discovery of God. Emphasis is laid on the varieties of experience through which this discovery may be brought about, and on the efficacy of education in inducing the conditions under which such discovery of God may be made. The aims stated by the International Sunday School Lesson Committee for the Graded Lessons include that of leading the child "to know God as he has revealed himself to us in his Word, in nature, in the heart of man, and in Christ." Athearn emphasizes the need, in the religious education of even the young child, of tying the consciousness of a personal God to the "child's world of experience so that day and night, sun, moon, and stars, sunrise and sunset, storm and rain, trees and flowers, parents, relatives, and friends, will all pull the God idea into consciousness by the laws of psychic association."[13] Coe seems to have the same thought in mind when he says, "Thus the whole world of the child may be filled with what a child can grasp of the divine. The religious life may be made a natural and joyous outpouring of his energy. . . ."[14] Betts maintains that "One of the most important tasks imposed on the religious curriculum is the cultivation and guidance of this God hunger, the setting up of the God-consciousness which at the beginning is entirely lacking in every individual. . . . Shall we not, therefore, plan our curriculum to develop in our children the fullest, purest, and most perfect concept of a divine Being which we of the present day have attained?"[15] At another point the same author discusses the place of education in making possible God's revelation of himself to his children, saying:

---

[13] From *The Church School*, pp. 63, 64, by Walter Scott Athearn. Copyright, 1914. Used by permission of The Pilgrim Press.

[14] Coe, George Albert, *The Spiritual Life*, p. 62, Eaton & Mains.

> Can religion be taught? Not in so far as concerns originating or conditioning the spiritual motivation which comes from a supernatural source. But in the sense of *making the individual aware* of this divine agency, of *preparing him to receive and make use* of it, of *opening ways* for carrying its influences over into expression, *yes.*[16]

Bobbitt sums up this objective very comprehensively in the following passage, which he states as one of the aims of education:

> Ability to catch for one's self such glimpses as are permitted to finite vision of the Being which actuates the universe as revealed in natural manifestations, in living creatures, in man-

---

[15] From *The Curriculum of Religious Education*, pp. 273, 274, by George Herbert Betts. Copyright, 1924. Used by permission of The Abingdon Press.

[16] From *Method in Teaching Religion*, p. 23, by George Herbert Betts and Marion O. Hawthorne. Copyright, 1925. Used by permission of The Abingdon Press.

kind, in man's highest examples, in the record of man's thought and action and aspiration as presented in history, literature, art, science, philosophy, and in man's religious literatures.[17]

Beyond these endeavors to lead the child into a personal experience of God, religious education must seek to lead him into a knowledge and understanding of God in terms of the best Christian thought. Too long have we looked upon theology as a subject to be confined to the seminary. As a consequence our children have grown up with the most grotesque ideas concerning the character and purposes of God. All too often this conception has been not at all according to the revelation in Christ. No teacher of religion can escape the responsibility for a reasonable familiarity with existing thought about the person and nature of God, and the necessity for constant checking of his teaching against this background.

2. *To guide growing persons into the development of a growing faith in God based on an increasing experience of conviction of the reality and truth of his being, character, and purpose.* If the task of teaching the child about God has been well done, it should most naturally lead him to an experience of faith. Faith goes beyond the mere mental appro-

---

[17] Bobbitt, Franklin, *How to Make a Curriculum,* p. 26, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

priation of knowledge about God, to the conviction of its truth, and the shaping of life and conduct in harmony therewith.

At no point will the teacher be less sure of his ability to gain his end by direct teaching. Here, if anywhere, he must depend on guiding the pupil's experience, arranging opportunities for him to come into the presence of God, and then trusting to divine providence for the outcome. Yet at no point is the wise guidance of the teacher more needed. It is so easy to let faith sink into mere credulity. Moreover, there must be constant watchfulness that faith be nourished as a tender plant so that it may grow with the increasing experience of the child. What is faith to the little child may be regarded as blind superstition and outgrown magic by the youth, and be rejected as such. Only as the meaning of God in human experience grows with increase in experience can faith serve as a positive element in adjustment to new conditions and needs.

Faith in God, as the term is here used, is a positive, outgoing trait of personality. It expresses itself in the evangelical fervor of a soul which has entered into fellowship with God. It becomes, thus, a dynamic power in life, undergirding and motivating conduct at every point where the individual recognizes his responsibility to God.

Of the need for faith in life, Chapman and Counts say:

> Students have wondered why it is that in an age of relative material abundance, an age toward which men have striven since the beginning of time, men are not content. The answer is simple. Without a faith of some sort, without a faith in which men can believe, men cannot live, men must despair. To be tolerable life must seem significant, and to be significant it must lead to some end felt to be of supreme worth.[18]

Of the place which this development of faith in life must hold in religious education, Weigle speaks in no uncertain terms:

> The final goal of our work is spiritual. No mere accretion of knowledge or outward molding of action can save the world or bring a single soul to fullness of life. "This is life eternal that they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ." The true teacher is an evangelist. He is not content merely to teach about God. He strives to reach the "hidden man of the heart." He seeks to help his pupils to know God in personal relation and so to love and serve him. He will not rest until in heart and will they have consecrated themselves to their Father.[19]

3. *To guide growing persons to respond to the experience of faith in the character and purpose of God with such attitudes toward him as dependence, trust, obedience, gratitude, and submission to his*

---

[18] Chapman, J. C., and Counts, G. S., *Principles of Education*, p. 355, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

[19] Weigle, Luther Allen, *The Pupil and the Teacher*, p. 215. The United Lutheran Publication House, 1911.

will. A knowledge of God, and a growing faith in him, should inevitably lead to those attitudes which most characterized Jesus' relationship to his Father. Unless religious education succeeds in fostering such attitudes, it will be untrue to the experience of the early Christians out of which the Gospels grew.

Dependence on the providence of God has been a cardinal tenet of Christian faith. It is an assertion of conviction that God is in control of the universe, at least to the extent which is adequate to the needs growing out of his relation to man. Upon this faith has been built the religious man's trust in divine guidance and strength when the need of the hour went beyond his own resources of strength and courage.

Recognition of God's benevolent power and purpose should lead to a spirit of obedience to him and his will. If such obedience takes the form of fatalistic dependence upon God without personal exertion in the interest of worthy ends, it has failed to grasp the dynamic meaning of faith. If, however, it manifests itself as an eagerness to place one's own will into harmony with one which is higher, so that the individual may become a co-worker with God for worthy ends, then it represents the unique meaning and motivation which religion should give to life.

From a pedagogical standpoint this objective of developing childlike attitudes toward God presents no insurmountable difficulties. On a background of home environment and from an experience of dependence on father and mother, the little child may readily be led into such attitudes toward God. Here, if anywhere, it is important that our basic religious education begin in early years. All nature points to the creative and sustaining power of God, and demands a faith in his providence.

It is this very ease with which the attitudes of dependence, trust, and obedience toward God may be taught which may lead us astray into teaching a faith which is unsupported by philosophical reason or religious experience, and may indeed be un-Christian in its implication. Of such a nature is the teaching that God may do *anything*, irrespective of the natural laws which must be broken. Such teaching must lead inevitably to thinking of him as a God of caprice, and to an experience of disappointment in his power. Again, an un-Christian interpretation of God's providence is that which encourages the child to believe that he may count on God to give him special favors, give him a unique rescue from danger, and bless him above others in God's human family. If God is a heavenly Father we cannot think of him as bestowing special favors on any of his children. He who maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust, is not likely to prefer one of his children above another in administering the gifts of his providence. The teacher of religion who would help his children to find God must not simply be a master of the art of pedagogy, he must also himself know God as he was shown us by Jesus.

4. *To develop in growing persons the practice of communion with God through worship.* Communion with God in worship is the heart of religious experience. Knowledge about God and growing experience of him should lead as naturally into worship as experience in the family leads to communion between parents and children. It is one of the primary tasks of religious education to introduce growing persons into the experience of worship and to train them in the technic through which the experience of worship may most readily be realized. "The training of the devotional life of children is but a part of their Christian education, therefore. It is that part which brings them consciously into communion with God through Christ. It aims to develop within them the power to know God for themselves, to love him and worship him, and to live in the happy realization of his presence and sustaining power." [20]

---

[20] From *The Training of Children in the Christian Family*, p. 191, by Luther A. Weigle. Copyright, 1922. Used by permission of The Pilgrim Press.

It is often difficult to draw a line of demarcation between moral and religious experience. Worship adds a quality to experience which lifts it definitely into the religious realm. We must interpret worship in a broader sense than the singing of hymns or engaging in formal prayers. It is an attitude of life lived in the consciousness of the presence of God and of relationship to him. "It might help us to restore worship if we could see just what is desired. Is it not this? Such social acts and customs as will do these things: definitely strengthen our sense of relationship with God; develop the reality of his constant presence in the home; help us to see the home as a spiritual institution; and help all members of the family to desire and purpose family living in religious terms. Worship is an attitude to be brought about by social situations which express our fellowship with God; it is the precipitation, in definite acts, of our joy in living as God's children, our desire for the life of the Spirit and our purpose to do his will."[21]

Worship may be thought of both as an end in itself and as a means to an end. As an end in itself it yields the deepest satisfaction to the human soul. As a means to an end it serves as a dynamic to right conduct and to harmonize human values into an integrated whole of which man's relationship to God is the center. From this latter standpoint Hartshorne [22] has suggested that the church school should have as its objective the presentation and illumination of some specific social value which shall through its emotional setting in the service be incorporated into the life of the child as it can be in no other way.

---

[21] Cope, Henry Frederick, "The Restoration of Family Worship" in *The Church School*, May, 1920, p. 4.

Recognizing that worship holds such a central place in the religious life, religious education should seek to develop within growing persons the ability to experience for themselves the satisfaction and dynamic which grows out of communion with God, and the disposition to seek the worship experience as a regular part of the activities of life. Here, as elsewhere, education must seek to lead the pupil to learn by doing. It is through actual participation in worship and through the experience of the satisfaction growing out of such participation that the practice of worship may be made habitual. To such experience must be added training in the technic of worship. Under this heading we would include training in the devotional use of the Bible, the use of hymns, quiet meditation, and active seeking after fellowship with God through the establishment of the conditions involved in what has been called the right religious adjustment.

---

[22] Hartshorne, Hugh, *Worship in the Sunday School,* p. 45. Teachers College, Columbia University.

The school of religion must carry the major part of the responsibility for making worship an actual fact in daily life. It is therefore desirable that the setting be made as favorable as possible. An important place must be assigned to the appropriate use of art and architecture. Not the least of the conditions which may be cited as favorable to the worship experience is that of the worshiping society. Association with the congregation should in and of itself lead normally into the experience of worship on the part of each individual.

Religious education has not discharged its responsibility toward the worship life until it has led the learner into the actual experience of worship. This is not to deny, however, that much emphasis must be laid upon learning about the meaning of worship. True understanding of the place of worship in life, and of the ways in which worship may most effectively be brought about, are essential as equipment for a satisfying life experience.

5. *To guide growing persons in finding God increasingly through service with and for men and an experience of harmony and fellowship with him through participation in his purpose.* The Christian

society is a community of persons in which God is a member, a Supreme Person to whom the individual bears relationship. In and through his growing participation in the creation and maintenance of such a society the pupil learns the true meaning of the fatherhood of God and of his own relationship to God. If we think of God as continuously at work in his world, then the right adjustment to the heavenly Father must include participation with him in the creation of a better and more perfect world.

There is no antithesis between this social interpretation of the meaning of communion with God and the more mystic communion which may be implied in the preceding section. Many persons may find their most intense moments of worship to be those in which they are most conscious of being fellow workers with God in the achievement of great human values.

No one has expressed more clearly the meaning of this fellowship with God in common social purposes than Professor Coe. The following quotations are typical of his clear and vigorous statements:

> If we can hold that the love that is toward God and the love that is toward men are not two, but one, and that this one is communion with the Father, then the social unfolding of a child can be luminous with divine meaning. There is, then, no antithesis between the socializing of the will and Christian experience. God speaks to the child, and the child to God in a

language that both understand. But if we hold that one's primary relation to God is purely private, that it has to do with subjective mysteries, and that only through a preliminary grasp of these mysteries is one prepared for truly Christian social relations, then indeed religion cannot be taught.[23]

Can there be any doubt as to which phases of our civilization and of our religions most loudly call for reconstruction through education? . . . We adults have not yet learned how to prevent war, or how to secure even the rudiments of justice to those whom we declare to be of infinite value in the sight of God. How far, then, are we, who do not yet love the brother whom we have seen, really acquainted with God, whom we have not seen? Do we really know how to worship? The intended implication of these questions is that the reconstruction of our collective life, and the reconstruction of our religions, constitute not two problems, but one. The differentia of religious education, when it is most radically religious, will be that it comprehensively and uncompromisingly interprets life as friendship or ethical love.[24]

Our worship, at its best, brings this divinely radical faith into immediate relation to the undivine conservatisms of our conduct, our God becoming to us at once a rebuker and a reinforcer of what we are. Our work in the world, whether we call it missionary, or evangelistic, or philanthropic, or mystical, or educational, is to bring men, by any and every means that works, to act as persons toward persons. Such action, wherever it occurs, is the Kingdom of God which the church, as well as each of us individually, must seek first. The constant endeavor of the true church, accordingly, is to empty itself into the world; to pour its radicalism out into all social institutions and relations, making them increase while it decreases; to make its own bounded self obsolete as far as possible.[25]

---

[23] Coe, George A., *A Social Theory of Religious Education,* pp. 75, 76. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917.

[24] Coe, George A., "What Is 'Religious' Education?" in *Religious Education,* April, 1923, p. 94.

From the standpoint of procedure in religious education, this ideal of fellowship with God in the creation of social values will best be realized through leading pupils into actual enterprises in Christian living. "The school of religion organized as a community which is a real part of the kingdom of God would include God as the Supreme Person with whom the growing person may have social relations. He should be made to feel the reality and the immediateness of the presence of God in the community. He should be made to feel that in the working out of these projects he is sharing God's purpose in the great ongoing enterprises that God has under way in the world." [26]

6. *To assist growing persons increasingly to control personal and social conduct in the light of God's relation to the world, and faith in the validity of the eternal principles of right and justice on which right living is based.* "The Christian ethics is indissolubly bound up with the Christian metaphysics; or better, in Christianity ethics and metaphysics are or-

---

[25] Coe, George A., *What is Christian Education?* p. 253. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.

[26] Bower, W. C., *The Educational Task of the Local Church,* p. 82. Front Rank Press, 1921.

ganically interdependent. Christianity is a way of life which is grounded in a way of conceiving the universe—Jesus' way of life, rooted in Jesus' way of conceiving God and the world. The recognition of the presence and power of God in the world of nature and in the life of men makes a difference at every point. Nothing is quite the same as it would be without him. The Christian religion infuses a new motive and spirit into the whole of moral education. It introduces a new perspective and range into the materials of knowledge and moral judgment; its appeal to the powers of appreciation, affection, and desire is incomparably stronger, richer, and deeper, and it assures to him who is striving for self-control and moral strength the backing of the universe; it renders available and effective the power and grace of God." [27]

When experience is lifted to the level of the religious, right living is seen not simply as certain convictions upon which men have agreed, but rather in the light of God's relation to the universe. Thus it is that increased authority is given to the moral law and tremendous impetus to right conduct. The question has often been raised whether morality can be effectively taught without religion. It is contended that only when right conduct is seen in the light of the individual's responsibility to God does it have the power to translate ideals into action. Whether or not this be true, certain it is that the Christian view of life which sees moral laws as rooted ultimately in the very constitution of the universe provides a powerful incentive for righteous living.

---

[27] Weigle, Luther A., *The Teaching Work of the Church,* pp. 41, 42. Association Press, 1923.

The place of religious sanction in conduct is thus expressed by two public-school men: "The association of religion and morality is of extraordinary significance. Being raised above the plane of mere expediency, morality is given a divine sanction. Since the individual in the act identifies himself with that central purpose which moves through the universe, the performance of duty becomes a joy. It exalts and idealizes and lends warmth to those principles of action which, if the Kingdom of Heaven is to come on earth, must find expression in the lives of men." [28]

---

[28] Chapman, J. C., and Counts, G. S., *Principles of Education*, p. 341, Houghton Mifflin Company.

CHAPTER VII

JESUS CHRIST AS OBJECTIVE

To lead growing persons into an understanding and appreciation of the personality, life, and teaching of Jesus Christ.

IF IT is *Christian* religious education which is under discussion, then it seems almost superfluous to insist that our objectives shall include an emphasis on Jesus. It is not so clear, however, how this objective shall manifest itself in specific form. At no point is there greater difference of opinion, vague generalization, and actual avoidance of coming to sharp issues than here. At no point is there greater divergence of view between denominations, and between conservatives and liberals within any denomination, than in our theory concerning him who is the corner stone of our faith.

This situation presents a nice problem in religious education. We have, on the one hand, an essential element of our religion on the interpretation of which there is wide divergence of thought among the leaders of the Christian movement. On the other hand, we have accepted an educational theory which spurns indoctrination of the young by transmission of a "finished" faith, but insists that each generation shall participate in the building of its own faith, on the basis of experience and under the guidance of the more mature members of the group. Much depends on our interpretation of the word "guidance." Does it mean an authoritative insistence on acceptance of beliefs held by a particular group? We must answer, as long as such beliefs are in the realm of "beliefs" and not scientific facts, *No*. Does it mean that we are to place at the disposal of the young our own reasonable faith, our experience in solving the problems involved, and the experience of others (even though it may point to different conclusions), with a willingness on our part to have them share in our quest for new levels of achievement? We would answer, *Yes*.

It follows as a matter of course, if we ourselves have found joy in being followers of Christ, that we want our children to be Christian. No doctrine of educational self-determination will convince the average parent that it is his duty to stand by and submit his child to the danger of choosing the non-Christian life without making at least an effort at pointing him to the way which he himself thinks to be best, and trying to convince him that he should walk in that way. The danger is that in so doing he will fasten on his child the pattern of his own mind without giving him the chance of discovery and acceptance of Christ for himself. It is only as the child becomes self-active in his decisions and choices that a genuine religious experience may take place.

Teachers of religion have not been wanting in an ambition to place Christ at the center of their teaching. Ask any hundred church-school teachers to state the objective of their work, and ninety-nine of them will include the Christ-objective in one form or another. The term "Christ-centered" is used to express this emphasis, and by some vigorous proponents is used as a contrasting term with "pupil-centered." Yet, what has this lofty ambition produced by way of results? A very dogmatic interpretation of the life and teaching of Jesus and his relation to human experience; a one-sided emphasis on this or that characteristic of the Master as the knowledge or whim of the teacher might dictate; an over-emphasis on the intellectual acceptance of theories about Christ; an utter failure to bring growing persons into such vital contact with Jesus that he has occupied a prominent, continuous, and growing place in their maturing experience—these are not unfair characterizations of the average religious teacher's work. The most positive value inherent in this teaching work has been in the nature of a by-product—the teacher's own regard for Jesus and his devotion to him. Let us admire this insistence on placing Christ at the center of the process of religious education, but let us at the same time see the need for a better educational method.

What, then, should be the responsibility of a study on objectives in religious education toward this central person in the Christian religion?

First, we must recognize that Christ does hold a central place in our educational task. Christian churches are agreed that their religious education must be "Christ-centered" if it is to be true to their aim and purpose. While there may be many theories concerning Christ, all agree that he is to occupy a place of importance in religious education. Let us beware lest in our eagerness for scientific establishment of the facts concerning Christ, and in our enthusiasm for reinterpretation of experience by each generation, we unwittingly lead the young to reject the data which have resulted from the religious experience of many generations through centuries of Christian history. In spite of the numerous attempts of hostile critics to disillusion modern civilization concerning Jesus, he still stands as the supreme figure in moral and religious life. The reverent attempts of Christian scientists to learn all the truth about Jesus which may be learned through the sharp instruments of science, have resulted in the loss of some of the unessentials of our belief concerning him, but have led us to see more clearly the qualities which make us bow reverently before him and say, "He is the Son of God!" Says one modern thinker, "Let one sit down before this portrait—this canvas across which the Galilean walks—and study its lines and shadings. Let one sit down before that picture without prejudice, as for the first time, and he must (if his idealism is worthy of the name) concede that man's imagination cannot proceed to further lengths or to more Himalayan heights of character than this! Jesus embodies the dream of man's inward perfection. Beyond Jesus there has been no subjective progress." [1]

Second, we must be true to our interpretation of education which asserts the supreme worth of the learner's personality and conceives education's highest function as being that of so guiding and enriching the learner's experience that he may *grow* into fullness of life and character. Here is no place for insisting that the learner accept a certain doctrine or be damned. Rather must we employ safeguards against a too powerful suggestion resulting from the position of authority of teacher or parent which may lead to unthinking acceptance of a completed doctrine and preclude the opportunity for mutual sharing in the building of a growing faith. Education may best perform its function through leading the young to face the issues of life and utilize the best in the history of the race as they move on toward the conquest of the problems in human living.

---

[1] Bradley, Dwight, *The Recovery of Religion*, p. 31, Doubleday, Doran & Company, 1929.

Third, we must embody in our objectives an element which will lead the learner to recognize the authority of established facts. Desirable as may be the attitude of open-mindedness, there is nothing to be gained by questioning that which is scientifically established as fact. It is in the use of facts, and in the interpretation of their meaning for faith and life, that the creative work of each learner may enter.

In our interpretation of Jesus Christ there are various strata of facts and opinions. It is highly important that our teaching make proper distinction between facts and opinions, in order that the pupil may build his interpretation on an adequate foundation. He has a right to know what in the life of Jesus is scientifically established, what is nearly established, and what is not supported by fact. He has a right to know the grounds on which we hold our inner convictions which are not supported by objective fact. Only thus can we avoid "indoctrination" of the pupil with our own unsupported views.

We do not intend to imply in the above statement that there should be comparison in value between objective fact and subjective conviction. A teacher's inner experience of the worth of Jesus and the reality of spiritual communion with him may be so real that it transcends the need for objective verification. What we are contending for is simply that this teacher shall not seek to indoctrinate his pupils with his own subjective convictions, but rather seek to give his pupils the bases on which their own convictions may be builded.

Theological and metaphysical considerations concerning the person and work of Jesus there must be, of course, but let these come in due time after the growing person has learned the truth of the Master's own saying, "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from myself."

Fourth, we will do well to consider the Christ-objective largely from the standpoint of the meaning of Jesus in present-day life and conduct, rather than from that of dogmatic theories concerning his person. There is practical unanimity of opinion on the moral perfection of Jesus, and on the efficacy of his teaching to meet present-day conditions.

When we seek to apply the implications of the life and teachings of Jesus to the development of a program of Christian living for today, both individual and social, we do of course discover wide divergence of opinion and practice. This, however, presents no educational difficulty, for we have already declared ourselves in favor of the principle that the learner shall have a part in the creative process of developing a life that is adequate and abundant for today. Far better that we do face the future without preconceived solutions for all problems, so long as we have a point of orientation by which to take our bearings. This point of orientation we find in Jesus.

This shift of emphasis from intellectual interpretation of Jesus to one of unity with him in his moral purpose is one of primary significance. Should the church generally accept this as the first criterion of orthodoxy, we would take the longest step toward Christian unity which has yet been taken. Professor Macintosh says on this point:

> It may be worth while to point out the mistaken nature of the notion often entertained that the adjustment is primarily or even exclusively intellectual—*i.e.*, that there is a law of religious experience the sole and sufficient human condition of which is correct religious opinion, or belief. Experience has long ago and time after time refuted this idea. To be sure,

among the Jews in the days of primitive Christianity belief in Jesus as the Messiah seemed the condition of the Christian experience of salvation; but this was because, under the special circumstances of that people at that time, such a belief was the cue to a whole series of practical attitudes, which were the real condition of the religious experience. But for most people in "Christian" communities today, the doctrine that Jesus was the Messiah, or Christ, is a commonplace of traditional teaching and belief; it has practically no spiritual dynamic at all. The "right religious adjustment" must be sought primarily in the volitional rather than in the intellectual realm.[2]

Fifth, in any comprehensive religious education, we cannot ignore the doctrines concerning Jesus. Too much of Christian thought is wrapped up therein, too much importance is today attached thereto, to permit us to pass this phase of our objective by, simply because no reasonable agreement has ever been achieved, even among Protestant evangelical churches, or, for that matter, within any one church.

What then shall we say concerning objectives in this area?

Any statement of objective must provide for wide variation as to content. This is not side-stepping the question. It is but opening the way for giving to each his inalienable right to his own interpretation of the facts available and his inner experience. That there will be wide divergence of views cannot be doubted. Not all views can be equally true, of course, though many divergent viewpoints may each have a part of the truth. Yet how can we do otherwise than take this position in a realm where not objective fact, but subjectively assumed conviction, holds the field? Let us add, however, that upon each teacher of religion should be placed the responsibility of submitting his views to the verification of objective fact wherever possible, and at all times to the test of reasonableness.

---

[2] Macintosh, D. C., *Theology as an Empirical Science*, p. 142, The Macmillan Company.

Perhaps some one will raise the disturbing question: "What of the child to be educated? Has he no rights in the matter? Should he, just because he is born in a liberal or conservative environment, be submitted to the beliefs dominant in that particular environment?" We may indeed pause to ponder this question. Every child has a right to the truth, of course. But what if two equally competent and conscientious groups disagree as to what the truth is, when there is no method of objective verification of the truth? Our modern educational approach holds a ray of light. Have we not assumed that in no case is it to be a process of handing on a completed faith, but rather one of giving the learner a share in developing a faith which is reasonable and satisfactory to him? Are we not then under obligation to bring the learner into contact with the best religious thought in its various aspects and encourage him to weigh and choose? That this lays a heavy strain on the teacher is evident. The strain is one of representing fairly other viewpoints than his own, and of being widely informed concerning the best thought on his subject. Yet the discipline involved in responding to these strains is not too great for the privilege of bearing the honored title of teacher. The compensations in the teacher's own enlargement of soul and development of personality will more than repay him for the effort of being a teacher according to the ideal here set forth.

It is difficult to deal in specific terms with the objective covering the meaning of Jesus Christ in religious education. The leaders in religious education who supplied the sources for this study are at one in their emphasis on the place which Jesus should occupy in religious education, but their language is often clothed in vague generalities.

This lack of being specific is also evident in the statements of objectives made by organizations. One would expect, for example, a very positive note at this point from so representative a group as the Jerusalem Meeting (1928) of the International Missionary Council. Yet we glean only the following phrases from the statement describing the meaning of *education in the Christian sense*: "a vital and saving experience of God revealed in Christ," "attitudes and habits of Christlike living," "understanding of the historic facts on which Christianity rests and of the rich content of Christian experience, belief, and doctrine."[3] The Educational Commission of the International Council of Religious Education, representing forty-one Protestant denominations in their work in religious education, proposes to accept this statement as its own, adding only the phrase, "to develop a deepening fellowship with Christ."[4]

We shall attempt here to extend our analysis only to four aspects of our general statement, and indicate what our studies would lead us to include as the interpretation of each. Further development of these specific aspects must await the results of future study. The theologian and the New Testament scholar must be counted upon for guidance in the field covered by this particular objective.

1. *To lead growing persons to discover in Jesus Christ the highest moral and religious ideal.* The followers of Jesus have been unanimous in their acclaim of him as the highest ideal of human living.

---

[3] The Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council, March 24-April 8, 1928, *Religious Education*, vol. ii, p. 4. International Missionary Council.

[4] *A Cooperative Curriculum Enterprise*, p. 11. The International Council of Religious Education, 1929.

Even those of other than the Christian faith have granted to him a unique position. He has served as a criterion of perfection to countless numbers, and research in the sources covering his earthly life has not served to dim this idealistic picture. "When we see a human personality showing some of those characteristics which seem to us to belong to Jesus, we all say together, that is what we seek in all our work."[5] One of our fundamental objectives must therefore be that of inspiring, controlling, and motivating the highest conduct by the ideals and purposes of Jesus. Christianity is a way of life, and when we seek for guidance in that way, we turn without question to Jesus.

The writings of the leaders in religious education abound in emphases on this objective. A few typical quotations at this point will help to illuminate this discussion:

> The second contribution which the Christian religion makes to character-building is *a religious person as the goal of moral endeavor*. The Christian religion demands a universal person as the object of moral aspiration. This it has in Jesus the Christ.[6]

---

[5] Soares, Theodore Gerald, "Is Religious Education Moving Forward?" in *Religious Education*, June, 1927, p. 641.

[6] Athearn, Walter S., "Protestantism's Contribution to Character-building in a Democracy," *International Journal of Religious Education*, June, 1926, p. 28.

The experience of Jesus represents the highest reach of the spirit in its attainment of ethical, social, and religious values. It may, therefore, be accepted as the norm of religious experience in those who are committed to the Christian way of life. He lived his life on the basis of certain assumptions. These were not only valid for his own experiences; they are valid for all who would live as he lived. That historical subject-matter, therefore, is of the highest value that helps the learner to discover the assumptions and convictions upon which he lived his life and did his work, his interpretations of the relations and functions of life, and the motives that impelled him to action.[7]

Religious education offers the church the only instrument through which it can successfully perform its primary function in the world. . . . In its briefest form the primary function of the church is *to make effective in present-day personal experience and social relationships the ideals of character and action set forth by Jesus in his life and teachings.*[8]

In the nature of things, the kingdom of God must grow chiefly by securing control of young life. The religious impulse must be fed and it must be led on to realize its full manhood through voluntary obedience to Christ. This is religious education.[9]

Guide the moral imagination of these boys and girls directly toward the transcendent Jesus Christ. Let him be the ultimate concrete reality in which their moral idealism finally rests; let them feel that higher than he, there are no values.[10]

---

[7] Bower, W. C., *The Curriculum of Religious Education,* p. 206, Charles Scribner's Sons.

[8] Betts, George H., "What Does Religious Education Mean to the Church?" in *Religious Education,* June, 1920, p. 161.

[9] Coe, George Albert, *Education in Religion and Morals,* p. 39, Fleming H. Revell, 1904.

In the carrying out of this objective we must, of course, maintain our educational-mindedness. No dogmatic and authoritative approach is intended. We have abundant examples of the ineffectiveness of such teaching in its negative results. Rather must we seek to expose the pupil to the matchless character of Jesus as we do to highest values in all realms, and let appreciation grow according to the laws of his own being. Only by such method may we attain to a glad and spontaneous acceptance of Jesus on the pupil's part.

If, as we have assumed, Christianity is a way of life, then the attainment of this objective will be realized only to the extent that the Christ-ideal becomes effective in conduct. Only when this ideal in turn introduces control into experience by inspiring each person to perform every act in harmony therewith may we say that success has crowned our efforts. Professor Bower calls this the most creative activity known to man: ". . . the conscious, purposive, and sustained endeavor to relate character and religion to life by understanding experience in terms of the ideals and purposes of Jesus, and by bringing the crucial and typical experiences which persons face and by which they realize themselves under his control." [11]

---

[10] From the *Religious Education of Adolescents*, p. 153, by Norman E. Richardson. Copyright, 1918. Used by permission of The Abingdon Press.

2. *To guide growing persons to a discovery of Jesus Christ as the true revelation of God.* Here is an expression of faith upon which Christians can agree, that in Jesus we have the most perfect representation of God. Scripture abounds in affirmations of this belief, such as "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us"; "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." It is difficult to conceive of any fundamental aspect of the character and purpose of God which is not implicitly or explicitly found in Jesus' life and teachings. Modern man is not so much concerned with the question whether Jesus is like God as he is concerned with the question whether God is like Jesus. Upon this conviction that Jesus showed us a true picture of God as a loving heavenly Father we found our faith that we may approach him as freely and frankly as children approach a father. "It is the function of religious education so to reveal Jesus Christ to our children that he shall command their admiration and respect, and enlist their loyalty and their devotion. The way

---

[11] Bower, W. C., "Protestantism's Contribution to Character-building in a Democracy," a review of Dean Athearn's address, *International Journal of Religious Education,* June, 1926, p. 30.

of life which seems to us good is Jesus' way of life, and we believe in that way of life, not simply because he believed in it and practiced it and it commands our admiration, but because we have faith that he knew what he was about, and we believe that the structure of the universe itself is such as he told us. We have faith in the kind of God who is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and it is the function of religious education to make effective in the lives of children that revelation of the character of God which is the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ."[12]

This unique place held by Jesus as the revealer of God makes this objective hold peculiar significance in our scheme of religious education. All that we have said in the preceding chapter about introducing the learner to a vital relationship with God does but emphasize the importance of interpreting God through Jesus. Christian religious education must not be less than Christian. We have too long allowed pre-Christian concepts of God to dominate in the early teaching of our children. Sometimes because we did not know how to do it better, sometimes because we were too lazy to take the trouble to do it better, sometimes because we were just careless, and most often because we used pre-Christian literature in our teaching, the conception of God which many children received has been such as to drive them from him in fear or distaste rather than to draw them to him in love. Let us seek to recreate in them the lofty concepts of Jesus through a vital contact with the Master's experience of God.

---

[12] Weigle, Luther A., "What Is Religious Education?" in *International Journal of Religious Education*, June, 1926, p. 25.

If our education is to move forward from the pupil's present experience and eventuate in an enriched experience, there is here an unusual educational opportunity. Life abounds in situations which involve an interpretation of God in his relation to the world and human life. The revelation of him which we find in Jesus provides the material out of which such interpretation may grow. Christian living assumes as one of its elements a vital and continuous association with God in work and worship. Jesus has shown us the way to the Father, and given us an ideal of what such God relationship may mean in human life.

3. *To assist growing persons to discover in Jesus one in and through whom fullness of life is found, and who challenges loyalty to his personality and work.* The place of Jesus in religious education is not exhausted by a presentation of him as a perfect example and as a revealer of God. He holds a unique place in Christian faith, which differs in kind

as well as in degree from that held by any other person. The fervent declaration, "He is the Son of God!" which has fallen from countless lips when the true majesty and glory of Jesus was seen, is more than an appreciation of a great moral character. A unique personal relationship to Jesus has been sought and won by his followers through the centuries.

It is at this point that it becomes most difficult to speak with clearness concerning our Christ-objective. Just what shall be the responsibility of religious education toward this more personal aspect of the meaning of Jesus in the Christian religion? The sources of our study give us little help. The words "acceptance," "Savior," and "Lord" appear frequently, but little attempt is made at interpretation. How widely doctrines differ concerning the meaning of such terms is a matter of common knowledge. At the risk of adding to the confusion we shall make an attempt toward a further interpretation.

What we have said before concerning the place of Jesus in religious education would lead us to seek to have growing persons accept him as the guide of their lives, the ideal around which their life philosophy may be built, the criterion for belief, conduct, and character. True teaching in this direction would lead us to the reasonable expectation that they would find themselves at one with him in spirit, purpose, and work. We should expect them to attain a further oneness and fellowship with him as they follow after him in seeking God. Thus would they increasingly find in him their Lord.

Jesus is also called Savior. Surely he is the Savior of the world in the sense of pointing the way to a new and better life. But he is also the individual's Savior. Men have found that through faith in him they may be saved from baseness and sin, and lifted to a higher plane of life. Christian experience in this regard is so clear that we would not be true to our purpose if we did not include this aspect of the Master's mission in our objectives. We do not talk so much of sin today as was done a generation ago. Behavioristic psychology has tended to confuse the issues which were at one time so clearly drawn concerning the individual's own responsibility for his deeds. Nevertheless, the fact of sin is still with us, if we mean by sin the failure of man to live at his best before God and with men. How then is he to be lifted from his sin unless we show him a Savior?

In spite of the danger involved in turning the minds of children toward the dark and less idealistic side of life, we cannot but maintain that a religious education which ignores the fact of sin, and the possibility and means of recovery from sin, is not true to the Christian history which it represents. That interpretations of the meaning of the atonement differ should not excuse us for leaving this whole area of human experience blank. Let us here as everywhere follow the principle of letting the pupil share in the creative building of his faith. Who knows but that the Christ of the coming Christians, on the basis of the thought and experience of a generation so taught, may be even more grand, more sublime, more *Christian*, than we have yet conceived him to be!

We close this discussion of the place of Christ in religious education with dissatisfaction. One cannot but be dissatisfied with any attempt at placing so significant a factor of life into mere human words. The best we may hope is that we have succeeded in making merely a suggestion or two, concerning the way toward a religious education which will make Christ more vital and effective in the growing experience of each new generation.

CHAPTER VIII

CHRISTLIKE CHARACTER AS OBJECTIVE

To foster in growing persons a progressive and continuous development of Christlike character.

THAT the development of Christlike character should be a major objective of religious education follows as a matter of course from the ethical teachings of the Christian religion. It follows, moreover, from our conception of man as a child of God, living in a divine family, and therefore destined to grow into the fullness of life in the divine image through this relationship. It is the persistent hope of religious educators that through the ministry of religious education, growth of the young may be so stimulated and fostered that they will develop a fullness of Christian personality far beyond our present realization.

Christianity is the religion of the abundant life. The primary interest of Jesus was in persons. Christian religious education must be interested primarily in persons, and in the development of Christlike personality through abundant Christian living. It is not things, but persons, which constitute the supreme values in a Christian world order. The creation of moral and spiritual persons, coming to self-realization through the doing of Christlike deeds and capable of participating with other persons in building a more Christian world, this is the goal of religious education, and beyond this ideal there is none higher.

One finds in the recent literature of religious education almost an over-emphasis on character development. This is the result of a natural reaction against the prevailing tendency in religious schools to regard religious knowledge and memorization of dogmatic statements of faith as a sufficient goal for their work. The following statement from Weigle is typical of this effort to direct attention more specifically to the *person* who is taught:

> As a teacher you aim, then, to develop a personality. You want your pupil not simply to know, but to live Christianity. You want him not merely to do right deeds, but to do them of his own will, knowing what he is doing and why he is doing it, and loving the right for the sake of the Father who gave him that freedom. There is but one real test of a teacher's work. God and men alike will ask you that one question. It is not, "What have you taught your pupil to know?" or, "What have you trained him to do?" but, "What sort of person have you helped him to become?"[1]

---

[1] Weigle, Luther A., *The Pupil and the Teacher*, p. 9. The United Lutheran Publication House, 1911.

Another tendency in present-day thinking which has directed attention to personal character is the recognition of the need for high standards of conduct in the citizens of a democracy. "To make democracy safe for the world" is a slogan which was heard on every hand a few years ago in support of religious education. The assumption underlying this reëmphasis on religious education in behalf of democracy is that religion is an essential element in ethical character. With this assumption we shall deal in a later paragraph. Our point here is that the growing realization of the need for individual character on the part of citizens in a democracy has turned our attention to America's alarming "spiritual illiteracy," and has awakened thousands of public-spirited citizens to an advocacy of religious education. The close relationship between the underlying philosophy of democracy and religious education is well set forth in the words of Professor Bower:

> It is clear, then, that democracy has to do with self-realizing persons as they live out their lives in a shared social situation. Whatever the details that ultimately may be involved in a philosophy of democracy, the placement of fundamental emphasis must rest upon *persons as such*—upon human values as over against all other values whatsoever. And that aspect of persons upon which it must focus its attention in the criticism of existing processes and in the creation of new processes is

precisely that upon which education focuses its attention—upon the ends and means by which persons realize themselves.[2]

This quest for Christlike character is in no sense antithetical to the effort in behalf of a more Christian society. It is, in fact, the only road to the Kingdom of God. "Things will not be right until people are right. The core of civilization is in our own souls. The Kingdom of God is within men. A right social order, common justice, peace on earth, and good will among men all await the growth of a good will of love and of the unselfish service spirit of Jesus in the minds of men and women. Whoever helps persons to will to live in love and according to the ways of the kingdom of heaven is building the future world at its foundations."[3]

There are some who are not friendly to the idea of setting up "character" as an objective. Their attitude grows out of a fear that some static ideal will become the goal of educational endeavor which will mold young lives into preconceived patterns and tend to promote an attitude inimical to growth after the preconceived ideal is thought to have been attained. This objection should be met, not by relinquishing character as an objective, but rather by adopting a more satisfactory definition of the meaning of character.

---

[2] Bower, W. C., *The Curriculum of Religious Education*, p. 38. Charles Scribner's Sons.

[3] Cope, H. F., "Making the New World" in *The Church School*, December, 1919, p. 13.

While we usually speak of character as something which a person *possesses*, we do not know character directly, but only through the person's conduct—the way in which he meets life situations. To be sure, we never know a person's *total* conduct. We do not even know all the factors in any particular act, for it is only the overt action which we may behold while the inner motives are hidden from our view. Only God, who can see the inner as well as the outer manifestation of conduct, may know a person's true character. Nevertheless, we have employed certain shorthand terms to describe the character of persons which everyone understands. When we say that a man is honest, everyone knows that we mean that in general he may be depended upon to make responses of a certain type to situations involving honest conduct.

The value of such summing up of our description of character in a single shorthand phrase is not so much that we may evaluate what a person is, but that we may predict what he will *do* in situations of a kind. Thus the emphasis is again on conduct. Such prediction of what persons will do in given situations is always only approximate, because we never know these situations fully, because situations differ so widely, and because there are certain inner factors motivating conduct whose operation cannot be determined beforehand. There is no sharp line separating the honest from the dishonest. Yet we know better what to do in our dealings with a person if we know that he is prevailingly honest or prevailingly dishonest.

Character, then, may be described in terms of what a person does. Moreover, whatever the inner mechanism of character may be, it too is the resultant of previous conduct—that is, of the person's reaction to his environment. If, then, education has as its goal the development of character, it must proceed from experience and lead back into experience of a higher order. Experience under guidance—this is just what our modern curriculum theories insist education must be. It follows further that character in this sense may never be thought of as a finished product. It is always in process of becoming. When we set up character as an objective, we do but state our intention to foster growth of the young toward the type of conduct which has been thought of as the "best." That there is at many points little agreement on what is "best" lays upon the educator the obligation to introduce the learner into the various conceptions of "best" and give him an opportunity to share in evolving a new "best" which is better than all that have gone before.

Underlying character there are certain psychological bases, such as knowledge and insight, ideals and attitudes, and habits and skills. While education in the past has overemphasized the transmission of knowledge, let us bear in mind that education does not come about *without* knowledge, either. We are today in the face of a new danger because the reaction against education as a transmission of knowledge has gone to the extreme of an education in which knowledge plays an exceedingly small part.

Teaching for right conduct means more than simply giving the individual an understanding of what right conduct is. Back of this understanding there must be the attitude and the ideal which will motivate conduct in the direction which is recognized to be right. An education for character which lays its emphasis upon outcomes in conduct, and tests its results by that criterion, is not likely to become one-sided in overemphasizing one or another element in conduct.

The objective of Christlike character is broad and general, and must be analyzed into more specific elements before effective education can be accomplished. One method of analysis is that of expressing the meaning of Christlike character in terms of a list of qualities or traits. Thus we say of a man that he is "honest" or "loyal" or "reverent" and describe his conduct as "honesty" or "loyalty" or "reverence." That is, there are groups of similar situations to which a given type of outcome has best served the welfare of both the individual and society. When an individual possesses the quality of character which leads him habitually to respond in this manner, we call it a "trait" of his character.

The approach to character from the standpoint of the desirable traits to be developed has been brought into question by a number of critics.[4] The line of criticism which is usually urged is that this approach does not provide for a growing conception of the meaning of right conduct as defined under certain traits, but rather tends to indoctrinate the young with static conceptions. That this danger exists cannot be doubted. All life involves hazards, however, and we cannot avoid hazards in education. A long line of moral leaders in civilization has established certain types of conduct as being desirable, and certain other types as being undesirable. It is not likely that in one generation this experience of the race will be reversed. No one can doubt that the meaning of honesty in all specific situations in 1929 could not have been fully surmised in 1900, because many of those situations were not known in 1900. The underlying principles on which honest conduct is based are, however, the same, and we should insist that each generation has not only the right but the obligation to define what is the particular application of these principles to the situations which are new to that generation. This is not contrary to sound educational principles.

---

[4] See, for example, George A. Coe, *What Is Christian Education?* chap. ix. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.

Another line of objection which is urged to this approach is that any one or all of a list of traits might be possessed by an individual, and yet that individual might not be a virtuous person. For example, loyalty means more than simply an abstract virtue. It must be loyalty to causes which are right if it is to have upbuilding value. Sometimes the kind of conduct which is described as disloyalty may be the most desirable from a Christian standpoint. But is not this objection met by a proper integration and balance of education in the various traits which are combined in Christlike character? Any sort of analysis of anything whatsoever has inherent within it this possibility of overemphasis or distortion of any of the parts, yet the human mind is so constituted that it can grasp wholes better and more fully when seen in the light of their several parts.

The final blow which critics of this approach seek to deal is that scientific investigations have proved that there seems to be no generalized trait such as "honesty," but rather that this is a "function" of a particular situation. In other words, children have been found to act with absolute integrity in some situations, and just the opposite in other situations which might be conceived to involve the same trait. This is not so much a proof that character traits cannot be established as it is an indictment of our prevailing educational practice. We have not tried a systematic education for the establishment of character traits. Generalizations are built up by experience in specific situations. Yet our practice has been to teach by generalizations only, without adequate attention to specific situations. If an individual holds an ideal of honesty but acts dishonestly in situations which he does not regard as involving the question of honesty, are we to deny the existence of this trait? Why disregard so readily the many situations in which the trait *does* function? Rather than point to the proof of the futility of this approach, may not the investigations which have been cited indicate the need for a more systematic character training? If we should attempt to teach by specific situations only, without attempt at generalization, our second state would probably be found to be no better than the first.

It is not maintained here that the approach from the standpoint of character traits is the only valid way of stating objectives. We have maintained throughout that best results will be achieved through approaches from many angles. We are concerned, however, that the value which this approach does have should be conserved in our effort to build Christlike character through religious education.

When we are dealing with education for Christlike character we have approached the problem of the relationship of religious education to what is technically known as "character education." This brings us face to face with the further problem of the relation of the religious school to the public school. Without in any way reflecting upon the extreme importance of character emphases in secular education, religious educators would maintain that they are dealing with the whole child, and that no education is complete without recognizing the great area of religious interest which is a part of human experience. The following two quotations will serve as representative of this viewpoint:

> For education now becomes, not two—religious and secular—but one. . . . There is one personality demanding that all its powers be trained, and there is one sphere of interests in which trained powers are to find use. This sphere of interests, Jesus has taught us to think, is or may be as truly divine as human. The field of the divine life in us is simply our life in its totality.[5]

> That which distinguishes religious education from general education is the explicit recognition of the greater range of powers in the person being educated. It regards the child not simply as having a mind, nor alone as a potential citizen, housekeeper, and wage-earner; it regards him as possessed of Godlike qualities, as destined to larger life in a society which holds in one life God and all mankind. To religious education he is more than an intelligence to be developed; he is a person to come to the fullness of life in a universe explicable only on the basis of the supremacy of personality.[6]

Religion, if it is to be vital and dynamic, cannot be confined to a separate compartment of life, but must influence all the areas of living. Consequently, religious education is not something set over against moral education, or a plus element, but rather a spirit which must pervade all education, and particularly education which has for its goal happy interrelationships among persons. Religious education must be regarded, therefore, as an essential

[5] Coe, George A., *The Religion of a Mature Mind,* p. 302. Fleming H. Revell, 1902.

[6] Cope, H. F., *Religious Education in the Church,* p. 42. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.

element in education for character which is to be based on the broadest foundations. It includes in its scope not simply the individual's relation to his fellows, but leads him to face those relationships in the consciousness that God is a factor in every human relationship and by his presence lifts each problem out of the merely temporal and gives it eternal significance.

Having presented these general considerations concerning education for the development of Christlike character, let us next look at some of the more specific aspects of this objective.

1. *To promote continuous growth.* Education is sometimes identified with a continuous reconstruction of experience. Plasticity and the ability to grow are therefore desirable ends to be sought in an education which is directed to the development of character. This is very different from that older conception of the function of education which fixed its eyes on the achievement of a certain type of adulthood as the highest goal. It is a recognition of the fact that in a changing world, the best we may do for our children is to help them in meeting the situations of today in a Christian way, and in so doing to develop an attitude and a method whereby the future may be met in the light of the elements involved in the situations of the future.

Modern education sees personality not as a completed product, but as at all times in process of becoming. "Growth is the first necessity of education, as it is its chief end. From the viewpoint of experience, growth is to be judged, not for what it is not, but for what it is becoming. It is just this quality of growth, of becoming, that makes progressive self-realization possible. It is growth that makes a place for the continuous reconstruction of experience." [7]

In accepting the principle of growth, religious education declares its faith in the possibility for continuous enlargement and expansion of the religious experience. It recognizes that even the youngest child is a personality, living, growing, maturing, with laws of life and development through which growth may be enhanced or arrested. It does not demand a mature Christlike character in the young child, but it counts itself as having failed except as it has caused his spiritual nature to unfold and grow toward the Christ ideal. Starting with the inherent capacities which God has implanted in the child, it seeks to foster his development toward the fullest possible self-realization in

---

[7] Bower, W. C., *The Curriculum of Religious Education*, p. 54. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.

Godlikeness. This is an achievement of the experience which we call religious.

> Growth in Christian motives means, therefore, changes in the pupil's outlook toward future social good. It means finer discrimination between relative values, and between ends and means, and corresponding change in fineness and breadth of appreciation, which is the beginning of fine and broad social conduct. This is the inner life that is to be cultivated; this is "growth in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."[8]

Having accepted the principle of growth, assumed responsibility for promoting growth, and recognized that growth in the spiritual life will follow certain discoverable laws, we have taken upon ourselves the obligation to shape our religious education according to such laws. We have already intimated that growth may take place through participation, under guidance, in the life of the Christian group. This principle should lead us to seek to make habitual such attitudes as the scientific approach to problems, open-mindedness, keenness to enter creatively into new experience, and the spirit of good will, so that the capacity to grow may be kept alive throughout life.

2. *To lead growing persons to an understanding of the nature and meaning of sin, and to an experi-*

---

[8] Coe, George A., *A Social Theory of Religious Education*, pp. 72, 73. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917.

ence of reëducation and recovery from sin. Much as we may desire to make the growth of Christlike character follow an even incline, it will inevitably have its ups and downs. The fact of sin is painfully real in human life. Christianity is a religion of redemption, and offers hope for ultimate victory over the forces which pull down, even though there may be many temporary defeats. Religious education which omits an understanding of the fact and meaning of sin, and of the means of recovery from sin actually committed, is untrue to the Christian gospel.

In our educational procedure at this point we must move with great caution. We have been warned repeatedly of the dangers of negative education. We know the suggestive power of holding before the innocent mind a picture of wrong-doing and evil. On the other hand, we must provide for an insight and discrimination which is willing and able to recognize sin when it exists.

Much unclear thinking concerning the meaning of sin has resulted from the fact that we have been too ready to identify sin with certain gross immoralities which only the depraved were supposed to commit, or with a certain catalog of overt acts which in themselves do not to many constitute moral evil. How can the growing boy or girl be expected to be greatly concerned about a thing which is not very real or tempting? Let us lay the emphasis more squarely on the inner motives of conduct. If we will define sin in some such simple way as "doing less than we ought to do, or being less than we ought to be, in the light of all the opportunities and circumstances" we will bring its meaning into the experience of every person who may hold membership in the church school. Such an interpretation of sin will point the way to the recognition of every moral situation as presenting an opportunity for choosing the higher rather than the lower way, and therefore a situation in which the possibility of sinning exists.

is sin?

Sin must be seen in a wider sense than that of individual transgression of traditional moral codes. Our greatest sinners are sometimes those who are, according to prevailing standards of morality, very respectable citizens of the community and even pillars of the church. The far-reaching evil effects of many individual and corporate acts which are not ordinarily regarded as wicked because the results are so far removed from the causes that we have not been in the habit of thinking clearly concerning accountability, should label such acts as the greatest of sins. True, we have not been without our prophets who have proclaimed the sinfulness of practices in business and politics which are commonly regarded as respectable, but which in their damning effect on hundreds and thousands of people should lead us to regard their perpetrators as among our arch-sinners. But the real meaning of sin, in all its ramifications and implications, has not held a large place in religious education. Creative education may find excellent subject matter in the problems involved here.

Finally, religious education should give thought to methods of reëducation and recovery from sin. All that Christianity has to offer in its gospel of redemption and salvation, all that psychology has learned about recovery from sin, should be utilized in building a technic of religious living which incorporates in its scope the problem of recovery from sin. That this is very difficult should not deter us from making the attempt.[9]

3. *To guide growing persons in the achievement of personal religious experience.* An educational theory which stresses experience as central should be received to the very bosom by religion. Where

---

[9] For a fuller discussion of the educational implications of this objective, see Coe, George A., *A Social Theory of Religious Education*, chap. xiii, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917; also his *What Is Christian Education?*, pp. 121-122, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.

there has been hostility to religious education it has been largely on the ground that it stressed too much the intellectual aspects of religion and too little the inner processes of the heart.

Historic Christian doctrine has made much of the regenerating life of God in the soul of man. Religious education seeks not to destroy this experience, but to fulfill it. How can any human agency fulfill what is given only to the power of God to accomplish? By providing the conditions through which the individual soul may be prepared to receive the fullest measure of the divine spirit. When God ordained that human growth should be subject to orderly processes which, if they were fully understood, could be stated as laws of life, both physical and spiritual, he made it possible for man to enter into partnership with him in fulfilling the divine resolve, "Let us make man." "Religious education does not seek to substitute education for religion, nor training for a vital religious consciousness. Religious education believes in and seeks to make use of the divine element in spiritual development as completely as could be desired by the most zealous of the evangelical group. The difference lies in the fact that religious education provides a way for the divine influence to impinge on the growing life constantly from the dawn of consciousness on through maturity."[10]

If religious education has been effective, every moral crisis, every situation demanding a weighing of values, should result in religious experience because it has transcended the realm of relationship with the self or others, and taken into its scope new meaning growing out of a vital relationship to God. Progressive and continuous decisions for the Christian way of life are the stuff out of which Christlike character is builded.

There is a phrase, "acceptance of Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord," which is much used in evangelical Christianity. What is its significant meaning, if any, for religious education? Is there something in "evangelism" which is not shared by religious education, or which is even antagonistic to it? Religious education should not be set over against evangelism, though it is true that adequate religious education will make obsolete certain types of evangelistic appeal. No religious education which understands itself will seek to accomplish its work without direct appeal to individual persons, without leading them into the experience of being saved from sin, without bringing them into clear expressions of loyalty to

---

[10] Betts, George H., "What Does Religious Education Mean to the Church?" in *Religious Education*, June, 1920, p. 162.

Christ and his ideals of life. Such personal decision for Christ is a necessary part of Christian living, and must therefore have a place in Christian teaching. Let us hear a few of the leaders in religious education on this point:

> It (religious education) seeks to direct developing personality into fullness of life. Formation rather than reformation is its motto. But it knows how to accomplish reformation in harmony with God-given principles of human development. In no sense does it claim to offer a substitute for the direct and immediate saving and transforming power of God in the heart; it is rather the surest and most natural means of leading the individual into a full realization of this divine power.[11]

> Far from discarding or disregarding the supernatural factor, the working of the "grace of God," religious education believes so thoroughly in this factor that its great aim is to keep the bond between the child and his heavenly Father from ever being weakened or broken. It seeks so to train the child and stimulate and guide his spiritual development that this divine grace shall have constant access to the heart and life, a sustaining, organizing, upbuilding power acting continuously upon the soul, rather than expecting it to reclaim a sin-sick soul which has lost its way.[12]

> The situations and materials should be so arranged that at the appropriate period of personal development they will evoke a personal response to the claims of Christ as Saviour and Lord

---

[11] Athearn, W. S., *Character Building in a Democracy*, p. 137. The Macmillan Company, 1924.

[12] From *The New Program of Religious Education*, p. 40, by George H. Betts. Copyright, 1921. Used by permission of The Abingdon Press.

upon the growing person. Such a decision should be a normal expression of attitudes and impulses that have resulted from previous religious training. It should issue in overt, personal, and formal choice of the Christian life and membership in the church.[13]

The Sunday school is an educational institution with an evangelistic aim; it seeks the steady, systematic development of the life of the child into the consciousness and fullness of Christian character and the training of all its people into efficiency and joy in Christian service. . . . We are all agreed that its aim is evangelistic, that is to say that it seeks to lead to the way of living and thinking, the habits of life and thought that see life as a good thing because it is God's, this world as good because it is his, and the future as bright with promise because it has the possibility of bringing his will to be done and making his love more manifest.[14]

The normal response of the child whose earlier training has been what it should be is the experience and decision called conversion. The experience is the gracious work of the Holy Spirit; the decision is the response of the awakened child of God. Both are necessary.[15]

If by evangelism we mean the regenerating work of God's spirit in the soul of man, religious education has this as its highest aim. If, however, we identify evangelism with a sudden, momentary conversion experience, then religious education has a different method of work. Its very foundation is laid on Bushnell's proposition that the child is a child of God and should never know himself to be otherwise. Growth there must be, and decisions—not one, but many decisions for Christ as the countless situations of life unfold before the growing child. It is true that these decisions are of differing intensity, and one may even overtop all others as *the* decision. But no completed Christlike character can be had in the twinkling of an eye. Religious educators do not deny the possibility of a momentary conversion experience. They maintain only that Christian nurture as a constant approach toward God, making unnecessary a turning-about experience, is a better and surer way. Even when birth into the Kingdom is by some sudden experience of conversion which completely reverses the former trends of life, it has usually been preceded by unnoted or forgotten educative influences, and must in any case be followed by a long process of education before Christlike character is established.

---

[13] Bower, W. C., *The Educational Task of the Local Church*, pp. 66, 67. Front Rank Press, 1921.

[14] Cope, H. F., *Efficiency in the Sunday School*, p. 92. Doubleday, Doran & Company, 1912.

[15] Weigle, Luther A., and Tweedy, Henry Hallam, *Training the Devotional Life*, p. 348. The Pilgrim Press, 1919.

Thus does religious education seek to develop Christlike character through progressive religious experience.

4. *To lead growing persons to the discovery and use of the spiritual technics through which may be*

realized the highest religious adjustment.[16] As there are laws which control physical and mental hygiene, so also there are laws which govern spiritual well-being. Religious education should include training in the method whereby growing persons may realize the highest spiritual achievement. Only thus can continual growth in Christian living be assured.

Macintosh has given a clear analysis of what he regards to be the conditions under which right religious adjustment may be achieved. These should offer a clue as to the approach religious education may find most effective:

> First, then, there must be *concentration of attention*, with the aid of appropriate guiding ideas, upon the Object of religious dependence, identified with the Source of religious deliverance, with special reference to a thoroughly moral end which represents "the soul's sincere desire." There must also be a whole-hearted or *absolute self-surrender* to the divine Being, a consecration and abandon of one's self to be worked upon and through by the divine Power; and at the same time an *absolute dependence* upon God with reference to the thoroughly moral and sincerely desired end which is to be realized with the assistance of the divine Power. It is also important that there be a willed *responsiveness*, or readiness for active expression, as the divine Being may seem to guide and impel. This is the really essential thing in faith. It involves trusting God; it is venturing to go ahead with one's own part in the process, counting upon God for adequate grace and power for the fulfilment of the duty before us. It is well, to be sure, to

---

[16] The term "religious adjustment" is taken from Macintosh's *Theology as an Empirical Science.*

cultivate the habit of waiting before God for the necessary "enduement with power"; but one should not be too dilatory any more than he should be too precipitate. And finally, there should be a steady *persistence* in the religious attitude just described. What is to be maintained here, then, is that the laws of empirical theology may be thrown into generalized form in a statement to the effect that, on condition of the above-described religious adjustment on man's part, God produces in human life and character certain moral experiences and qualities, with tendencies toward certain further consequences.[17]

Henry Nelson Wieman, in his book, *Methods of Private Religious Living*,[18] maintains that there are certain methods whereby spiritual results may be achieved, and describes these methods. From the work of men like these it should be possible to formulate in a simple way the technics which should be at the command of every Christian in developing his religious life. The school of religion must take responsibility for training persons in the technic whereby greatest spiritual results may be achieved.

5. *To develop in growing persons an increasing ability of self-direction and self-control in moral and religious situations.* Education which places the highest value on the development of personality must provide the learner with the power to guide his own actions toward the achievement of the best

---

[17] Macintosh, Douglas C., *Theology as an Empirical Science*, p. 144, The Macmillan Company, 1919.

[18] The Macmillan Company, 1928.

religious experience. It is of the very essence of ethical conduct that the person shall have a creative share in determining his acts. Education for Christian character cannot be successful by making all decisions for the learner, but by helping him to stand on his own feet in the face of moral issues. Only thus may he be prepared to meet the changing conditions and situations of a changing world.

Religious education must seek to help growing persons win that freedom which is their divine right as sons of the Father. This emancipation will come gradually. True education in school or home will help the child to win his freedom a step at a time as he demonstrates by his use of liberty that he is ready for yet more freedom. A fine balance must be maintained between too much guidance, which shackles the spirit, and a freedom which is so unguided as to crush rather than uplift.

> Thus, education is not the imposition of patterns of conduct imposed upon passive subjects by the representatives of a static, organized adult society, nor the self-willed choice of a sheer individualistic self-determining person, but the sharing of purposes by which the mature members of an ongoing society assist its immature members in criticizing and organizing their purposes and in choosing their experiences in the light of the best experience of the race.[19]

---

[19] Bower, W. C., "The Curriculum as Enriched and Controlled Experience," in *The Journal of Religion*, October, 1927, p. 507.

> We fail in the religious education of our children if our teaching does not result in their final emancipation from a religion of mere authority and convention and their growth into a religion of spirit. We aim, not simply to win their assent to a given body of beliefs or to attach them to the church as a saving institution, but to help them to become men and women who can think and choose for themselves. The Protestant principle of the universal priesthood of believers involves democracy in religion.[20]

Education for freedom involves certain hazards which must be assumed. Parents and teachers must, on the one hand, place at the disposal of the young their own more mature experience, but they must not, on the other hand, substitute their own decisions and choices for those the learners themselves should make. Growing persons must be led to recognize the authority of those who by experience and merit are worthy leaders, without surrendering their own right of self-determination.

> Horace Bushnell put it rightly when he said that the goal of all moral instruction and training is the ultimate emancipation of the child. We want to help our children to become individuals capable of standing on their own feet before God and man, free, responsible, efficient, with initiative and resource, yet reverent, obedient to authority, and imbued with the spirit of good will and of service.
>
> We want our children to obey, yet not to obey everybody or to remain incapable of making decisions for themselves. We

---

[20] Weigle, Luther A., *Religion and War*, p. 114. Edited by E. Hershey Sneath. Yale University Press.

> want them to exercise and to develop initiative, yet not to be rude, grasping, and self-seeking. We want them to find out for themselves as many of life's lessons as they can with profit learn in that way; but there are some things which we must frankly teach them, and some from which we should protect them. We want them to learn to know, understand, and obey the great rules of the game of life, as these have been revealed in the moral experience of the race.[21]

While education must be given in present-day situations, it has a constant reference to the future. We must not be satisfied in the attainment of our objective when we have succeeded in teaching our pupil what is right conduct today. We have seen too clearly already the havoc which may be created when people try to live morally in twentieth-century situations with ethical conceptions which were intended to fit the nineteenth. Kilpatrick has pointed out to us in his book, *Education for a Changing Civilization*,[22] that perhaps the best we can do for each new generation is to give them a *method of attack*. If we help our children to recognize the significance of moral situations which they face, to bring to the evaluation of these situations the principles on which righteousness must rest, to interpret the teachings of Jesus in a new day, to develop the habit of *acting* when once the right course is clear, then we will do more for them than if we try to supply a ready-made solution for every situation which they may face.

---

[21] Weigle, Luther A., "Home Training and the Problem of Authority," in *General Sunday School Board of the M. E. Church, South*, p. 5, 1923.

[22] The Macmillan Company, 1926.

Kilpatrick maintains that ethics in our relation to the young demands that we refrain from "indoctrination"—that is, intentionally enslaving them to our way of thinking without such respect for personality as means the continued development and expression of each to the fullest degree possible, in reciprocal relation with others. "Children are so docile, so trusting, so little able to detect fallacies, so easily led in argument to give weight according to personal love and trust, and there is in these matters so much at stake that every parent will feel responsibility for a just protection. But what protection is just and how shall we contrive to secure it? These are matters not easily settled, certainly not by a sentimental preference for our hitherto cherished views which makes us oblivious to a higher duty both to truth and to our children. We accordingly must call a sharp halt to any sentiment which would, under the guise of child protection, give *carte blanche* to any parent or group of parents or any adult organization whatever to fasten in their young any cherished belief which they in their prejudice happen to think necessary."[23]

The method by which this ideal of self-direction may be attained is that of experience under guidance. The only way in which growing persons can effectively learn to live morally and religiously is by actual experience in moral and religious living. We approach this end through every means whereby children are helped to know right from wrong, and to feel the satisfaction of choosing the higher rather than the lower way. "Wherever, through an immediate situation produced by the children themselves and understood by them, needs arise for help in treating and considering each other and the group as a whole in more desirable ways, there lie the opportunities for discussion, instruction, and practice that contribute to moral growth. Merely talking about moral behavior in the abstract, or illustrating it by stories or biblical quotations, seems to take little hold upon the behavior tendencies of children; but when a real situation in their own personal relationships arises, it has significance and meaning for them."[24]

---

[23] Kilpatrick, W. H., "Thinking in Childhood and Youth," in *Religious Education*, February, 1928, p. 135.

[24] From the Introduction, by Frederick G. Bonser, to *The Golden Rule City*, p. ix, by Edna Madison Bonser. Copyright 1927. Used by permission of The Pilgrim Press.

6. *To lead growing persons into the actual experience of Christian living.* What is here stated as end has been emphasized again and again as method. Christlike character is not a status apart from life. It is a quality of living. It follows that education for Christlike character must be concerned with a many-sided experience in living.

The essential condition which education supplies in meeting the situations of life is *guidance.* Religious education must seek to guide the learner in making Christlike responses to actual situations of many types. The function of guidance is to help the learner analyze the factors in his situations, to understand their meaning in a wider sense, and to consider the possible lines of action and the consequences of each. Guidance seeks to introduce a larger measure of control into situations, to the end that the learner may win *self-control.*

Religious education is concerned with enriching life in terms of religious significance and eternal values. It endeavors both to broaden human contacts and fellowships and to deepen experience so as to include God in its relationships. "Education becomes religious: When it becomes completely rational—that is, when it is no longer content merely to describe, count and couple particular facts, to cultivate particular aptitudes and to create particular bonds between situations and active responses: but presses on, above these and including these, to a synthesis of belief, conduct and character which has explicit reference to the Whole of which human life is a dependent part."[25] This is sometimes spoken of as introducing religious sanctions into moral conduct, or "undergirding morality with religion."

Concerning the necessity for or the efficacy of such religious sanctions there is at present no agreement. The following are a few typical statements assuming the necessity for such undergirding of morality with religion:

> The task of religious education is to motivate conduct in terms of a religious ideal of life. The facts and experiences of life must be interfused with religious meaning.[26]

> It is futile to inquire, as some do, whether we cannot be moral without being religious, and ethical without the support of any supernatural Power. The more practical and pressing question is whether we can, with all the obstacles in the way, be practically moral and consistently ethical with the help of religion and *with* the support of a higher Power.[27]

> Unless, therefore, religious education can vitalize our morality with spiritual ideals and motives we cannot hope for

[25] Weigle, Luther A., "What Makes Education Religious," in *Religious Education*, April, 1923, p. 91.

[26] Athearn, W. S., *A National System of Education*, p. 30. George H. Doran Company.

[27] Betts, George H., "What Makes Education Religious?" in *Religious Education*, April, 1923, p. 86.

> the continued endurance of a sound moral life, without which society cannot exist.[28]

On the other side of the question may be quoted such a statement as the following:

> One concluding word about morals and religion. Many of us in this country, most, I think, of those who speak most authoritatively in education, feel that morals have no need of support in dogmatic theology. For my part what is said above, properly understood, will care inherently for morals and religion better than will any scheme of separate lessons in either or both. Surely morals and religion in any defensible sense lie at the heart of the life process. When we care properly for life and its education we care properly for them. The name of either need then not appear as a separated item in the school program. If we take pains that life's meanings are got as best we can from each succeeding experience, all is done that man can do.[29]

Our best answer to the problem of "religious sanctions" is in the experience of Jesus. To him ethical conduct was never just a problem in human relationships, but included a recognition of a common fatherhood of God. To him religion was never just a relationship of the individual to God, but included a sense of obligation to other children of the same Father. We have no doubt erred in conceiving "religious sanction" in a manner too utilitarian. Some have tried to invoke God as a policeman to compel righteousness. While any authoritative statement must await the results of research in the dynamics of character, there does seem to be abundant reason to believe that a wider world-view which includes God as Christ showed him to be must of necessity have a wholesome influence on ethical conduct. A vital faith in God places moral obligations on the individual, for he becomes a co-worker with God. A very sane summary of this question has been written by two public-school men:

---

[28] Bower, W. C., *The Educational Task of the Local Church*, p. 28, Front Rank Press.

[29] Kilpatrick, William H., "The Philosophy of American Education," in *Teachers College Record*, October, 1928, p. 21.

> Whether this supernatural sanction is necessary to the control of conduct, as Bryce suggests, is a matter of speculation concerning which there is no general agreement. As yet the evidence on either side of this question of profound social significance is inconclusive. That the authority derived from a consideration of social expediency may be sufficient to insure the formation of desirable habits and ideals is certainly a tenable hypothesis. At some time scientific experiment may prove its truth; but until this proof is forthcoming, it would be the height of educational folly to abandon gratuitously a force which has served so powerfully to control conduct in the past. At present human experience indicates that any program, designed to foster the development of morals, can hardly afford to ignore religious influences.[30]

7. *To guide growing persons in the achievement of an articulate expression of a developing personal*

---

[30] Counts, G. S., and Chapman, J. C., *Principles of Education*, p. 343 ff. Houghton Mifflin Company.

faith. Life demands adherence to some belief. Inward experience should in time eventuate in an outward expression which the learner is willing and able to defend as his own position. In our eagerness to break away from traditional beliefs accepted on authority of the church, we are in a fair way to going to the opposite extreme of developing a generation which knows not what it believes—and glories in its lack of creeds!

Professor Bower has in the following quotation given a clear expression to the relationship of truth to the moving current of life:

> A second function of the dynamic curriculum should be to create a vital conception of truth. It should lead the growing person to seek the sources of truth, not in an authoritative institution or literature, but in the warm and moving current of life itself. It should lead him to discover it in gripping convictions rather than in dogmas or theological formulations. It should lead him to think of truth as a function of life and therefore a living and growing thing. . . . A vital view of truth will look to the future with even more confidence than to the past for the fresh discoveries of the spirit that await those who can keep open their contacts with reality, and who will not only hospitably receive new truth, but seek after it as the chief quest of a devoted life.[31]

The question of religious education's responsibility toward the creeds is here sharply raised. One thing is clear, the educational position which we have assumed, giving the learner a creative part in the formulation of his own belief, does not permit the dogmatic indoctrination of the young with creeds and doctrines which represent a finished faith. But shall we, on the other hand, ignore the creeds? Four considerations will help clarify our thinking.

---

[31] Bower, W. C., *The Curriculum of Religious Education,* pp. 255, 256. Charles Scribner's Sons.

(1) A creed is the outward expression of an experience. The validity of the creed depends on the validity of the experience it represents. Its general value depends on the extent to which this experience is general. Its value for any given generation depends on the faithfulness with which it represents the experience of that generation, and aids in the furtherance of desirable religious experience.

(2) If, then, a formal statement of belief is secondary to the experience it represents, each generation should be expected to make a creative contribution to the statement of its creed. While it may be maintained that religious experience as such does not greatly change, it must be admitted that emphases and judgments of value do change, as do

also the meanings of the words in which our thoughts are clothed. It is folly to continue to express thought in forms which are a stumbling-block to a generation which knows not their meaning.

(3) With each individual, formal expression must follow experience. Let the comprehension of doctrines, the formulation of beliefs, follow as a natural consequence on living with God and for him in the developing Christian life. Who has not had the experience of discovering in an articulate statement the thing which to him "oft was thought, but ne'er so well expressed"? Formal expressions of belief become the normal results, not the antecedents, of Christian experience.

(4) Finally, the creeds of the church do represent a value which has slowly accumulated through centuries of Christian history, and which religious education may not blindly ignore. "While it is true that the purpose (of religious education) is best conceived in terms of the pupil's own spiritual maturity as one able to think and believe for himself, such maturity is not to be begotten by a policy of keeping from him the beliefs of his elders, but rather by their frank and sincere presentation of the truth as they see it. The question is not, Shall the church's creed influence its teaching of children? but, How

shall the church most wisely use its creed in the religious education of its young?"[32]

8. *To guide growing persons into creative living and a forward-looking faith.* The universe in which we live is not static, but living and moving in a never-ending process of becoming. We believe that God is at work in his world, creating new values, revealing new truth. We believe that it is the privilege of man to participate with God in this eternal process of evolution, and that through such participation man will come to a surer knowledge and more perfect understanding of him. Man must, then, maintain an open mind and expectant attitude toward new truth and higher values. He should have an active interest in and a constructive attitude toward the discovery of God's laws for the world, man, and society.

This conception of things in process, this faith that God has still new truth to reveal to men and new value to impart to them, must become one of the objectives of religious education if it is to eventuate in creative Christian living. We have been too prone to stultify individual effort because we have fixed the eyes on a perfected status which all might seek after, but none quite attain. A more dynamic view must come to the fore. "The clear conviction that God has been creating the higher values of life in and through the experience of men is one of the chief ways of arriving at a vital understanding of God and of opening up the unlimited possibilities of religious experience in and through which God is still working." [33]

---

[32] Weigle, Luther A., "Place of Creeds in Religious Education," in *Nelson's Encyclopædia of Sunday Schools and Religious Education*, p. 317.

9. *To guide growing persons to self-realization through choice of and service in vocations, on the basis of Christian principles.* If religious education be education for Christian living, then it must have large concern for men's vocational interests, because so large a part of life goes into vocations. Religious education in the past has made much of Christian service, but such service has usually been conceived as marginal time activity or the expenditure of means. It is time that more emphasis be placed on the realization of Christian ideals through the choice of and labors in one's calling. In view of the very important relation of what one does to what one is, it should be a matter of great concern to religious education what its pupils elect to do as a life-work. While vocational activities are in a sense an expression of character, they are just as surely the roots of character also.

---

[33] Bower, W. C., *The Curriculum of Religious Education,* pp. 205, 206. Charles Scribner's Sons.

When in the past the vocations have been given a place in religious education, it has usually been in the form of effort to enlist men and women in full-time religious service. So much have the claims of life service in Christian callings been stressed that too frequently the impression has been left with young people that if they cannot answer the call to "enlist," God has no further interest in their life-work. The church must, of course, provide for the development of its professional leadership. We are here primarily concerned, however, with the relation between vocation and character.

Strictly speaking, we are not concerned so much with what one does for a living, so long as the vocation is essential to the well-being of Christian society and a fitting avenue for the expression of Christian personality, as with the spirit and ideals under which the activities are performed. Does the vocation offer an opportunity to make one's spiritual ideals and principles effective? Is it entered into with the conviction of a "calling"—that is, in the spirit of sharing with God in the work of the world? Does it offer an opportunity for the development of Christian personality? These are questions which do vitally concern us as educators.

Since religious education at present is concerned most predominantly with children and young people, its work toward this vocational objective is concerned primarily with what is usually known as "vocational guidance." The purpose must be one of developing right attitudes toward vocational life, and to lead to a choice of a vocation in the light of Christian considerations.

Religious education has a particularly important function to perform here. The *interpretation* of work as a vocation of service to the world, rather than as a means of selfish plunder; the *dignifying* of work as a worthy human enterprise, essentially alike in its spirit whether the activity be mining coal or operating for appendicitis; the *beautifying* of work by getting the spirit of Christ into control of its human relations—all these are tasks appropriate to Christian education and should find a place in any course of study and training that has for its purpose the making of Christians.[84]

10. *To develop in growing persons the ability and disposition to take responsibility for leadership in Christian service.* This objective concerns itself with those non-vocational activities through which the cause of the Kingdom may be advanced. In addition to living out Christian ideals in the labors of their callings, the followers of the Master are laid under obligation to serve in home, church, and community.

Religious education must be outgoing as truly as foreign missions. "Come unto me," said Jesus, but when men had come to him he said to them "Go." This is the spirit of enlightened Christian education. It seeks to lay upon pupils a mission. It does, indeed, say: "Come into the church fellowship," but it adds, "Let us go."[35]

---

[84] From *Childhood and Character*, p. 208, by Hugh Hartshorne. Copyright, 1919. Used by permission of The Pilgrim Press.

There are many avenues in which Christian service will express itself. The building of Christian families, for example, demands of men and women the highest type of leadership. It is a responsibility for which definite training is required. Religious education cannot shirk this responsibility of providing for adequate preparation for family life.

The Christian church, the organized representative of Christianity, depends to a large extent on the marginal time of men and women for its leadership. If we may take for granted the essential place of the church in the realization of individual Christian character and a Christian social order, then we must include in our religious education of individuals proper preparation for service in the church.

Communities take on their particular character through the activities of men and women who are concerned with wholesome environment in those communities. Christlike character must spend itself in the quest of the highest type of community life.

---

[35] Coe, George A., *A Social Theory of Religious Education*, p. 229. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917.

Such service implies relief of suffering and need, of course, but it must be a service rendered in the spirit of fellowship and love, and not in the spirit of pity and condescension. Much more, however, does it concern itself with leadership in such processes of group life as will help lift the community to a more Christian level. Service is not *for* others. It is the sharing of labor *with* others and with God to the end that common values may emerge.

In its highest form, Christian service expends itself in leading other individuals into the Christian way of life. A discovery of the worth of the Christian way should be the impelling motive for leading others into a similar way. Here above all else is needed love and respect for personality. Good intentions must be accompanied by ability in method. True education may not be supplanted by indoctrination. Example must draw rather than social pressure compel.

11. *To cultivate in growing persons the ability and disposition to follow the guidance of spiritual leaders.* This objective is not a contradiction of the development of personality through experience in self-determination and self-direction. It is rather a completion of that principle through giving experience in the weighing and using of authorities. There

are those who merit positions of leadership. It is folly for each individual learner to depend only on his own limited experience for guidance when there are those who by ability and experience can help him to see farther and feel more deeply. If this becomes a discriminating acceptance of leadership in relation to actual life situations and needs, it will be more than a blind following. It will be a creative act of self-determination toward desired ends. Such "followership" ability requires specific development as well as does leadership ability.

This we submit as a very inadequate analysis of the objective of Christlike character. We do so in the full knowledge that any analysis is unsatisfactory. Yet analyze we must if we would reduce our concepts to working units. The parts do not adequately describe the whole. Taken singly, they may even contradict the whole objective through overemphasis on one of its aspects. But taken together, in proper proportion and in proper relationship to each other, we submit them as an approach to this important objective of Christlike character. If they serve but as a check-list by which to test our teaching of religion, they will, to that extent, help to bring us nearer to our goal of complete Christian living.

CHAPTER IX

THE GOOD SOCIETY AS OBJECTIVE

> To develop in growing persons the ability and disposition to participate in and contribute constructively to the building of a social order embodying the ideal of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

WHEN the emphasis in individual character was toward the saving of the soul for another world, then a sharp line might have been drawn between the objective for the individual and that for society. Today no such distinction is possible. In our discussion of Christlike character in the preceding chapter we recognized that character is not a status but an outgoing relationship toward others. In our discussion on the good society we must bear in mind that society is made up of individual persons, and that the betterment of the social order will come about only by the more complete socialization of the individuals who constitute society. We have, in fact, but two ways of looking at the same thing. Coe has comprehended this twofold nature of religious education in a single definition, which has justly become famous: "Growth of the young toward and into mature and efficient devotion to the democracy of God, and happy self-realization therein." [1]

Yet it is desirable that we look at these two aspects of the task separately. Individual character has too often consisted in negative goodness, too often taken the position that the individual's relationship to God did not involve an obligation toward men, for us to assume that the character objective will lead us to a completely social viewpoint. It is too often true that the "good" man is the one who most readily subscribes to social conditions as they are without raising the question of what would happen if he took seriously the teachings of Jesus to which he offers lip-service. Let us then in this chapter ask specifically what we must do to bring about the ideal society through religious education.

One needs in our day to offer no justification for emphasizing the social aspects of religion. The preaching of the social gospel has become common among us, even though its practice still lags far behind.

True religion works toward a social end. The prophets were preachers of social righteousness. Jesus' conception of the

---

[1] Coe, George A., *A Social Theory of Religious Education*, p. 55. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917.

> kingdom of God was that of an ideal social order, wherein men fulfill their sonship to the Father, and hence are brothers. When he pictured the Day of Judgment, he described the final test of life in social terms. "The stern questions are not in regard to personal and family relations, but did ye visit the poor, the criminal, the sick, and did ye feed the hungry?" He sent forth his disciples, as he himself had been sent, not to be ministered unto, but to minister. His call is to a life of service.[2]

Thus, under the guidance of the spirit of God, religious education undertakes the regeneration of society through the regeneration and Christian education of individuals. It has heard and is seeking to follow the message of the Master "that ye love one another." Coe finds in this new emphasis the very essence of religion: "To us the most religious thing in religious education is the vision that it fosters visions of a new collective ordering of life, of a new experience of 'Immanu-El'—'God is with us'—and of a new kind of initiation of children into religious fellowship . . ."[3]

A tremendous impetus has been given to the social aspect of religious education by the emphasis in recent years on education for life in a democratic society. The phrase "democracy of God" has been suggested as more accurately describing Jesus' ideal for the good society than "kingdom." Certain it is that democracy's high regard for the individual personality, and its emphasis on full and free interaction among the members of the group is closely akin to the Christian ideal of the family of God. Relation to one's fellows is a necessary part of true life. Public education is coming to this recognition, and is stating its objectives in terms of social living rather than in terms of individualistic knowledge, culture, and power. Surely religious education may not do less than center its objectives in happy self-realization in the divine society.

---

[2] Weigle, Luther A., *The Pupil and the Teacher*, p. 206. The United Lutheran Publication House, 1911.

[3] Coe, George A., "What is 'Religious' Education?" *Religious Education*, April, 1923, p. 93.

Through losing itself in striving for a Christian social order, individual character will find itself. Persons do not come to self-realization in isolation, but in association with other selves in a society that is also moving forward with increasing self-consciousness toward bringing its relations and functions under the control of spiritual ideals and motives. Character does not thrive in seeking itself, but in seeking some value outside the self. " 'Character' will become popular," says Hartshorne, "when it ceases to be the mark of the pharisee and is recognized as the prerogative of all who seek, each in his own way, to make '. . . justice roll down like waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream'."[4]

Through gradual participation in the interests and activities of the community of believers, the fullest growth of the child toward mature Christian character will take place. The test of any program of religious education will consist in the answer to the question whether it makes a difference in social as well as in personal living. It should therefore seek to introduce the child into the problems of the Kingdom, and through activities of Kingdom-building help him to grow to maturity with a definitely formed purpose of helping to bring in this divine society.

Having looked at this objective in its general aspects, let us make an attempt to analyze it into more specific terms and see what task each aspect lays upon us as we set it before us as an end for educational endeavor.

1. *To lead growing persons to reverence and respect the personalities of other human beings.* The one word "love" expresses this ideal and warms it with emotion. Such reverence and respect for others must be the foundation of any social group which is to live as a family of God. What is more natural

---

[4] From *Childhood and Character*, p. 240, by Hugh Hartshorne. Copyright, 1919. Used by permission of The Pilgrim Press.

than that the common fatherhood of God should lead to this respect for other human beings? For if God loves all his children, they must have for him infinite worth. If, then, any child is to be at one with the Father in purpose and spirit, he must love his neighbor even as he loves himself.

This is the logical outcome of living as children of God. It is not necessarily true, however, that ethical love has its genesis in a recognition of the meaning of the fatherhood of God. It may be that the comprehension of the meaning of the fatherhood of God itself grows out of love for one's fellows. Coe discusses this question in a recent book,[5] and presents a good deal of evidence for this latter position. He suggests that there must be a reciprocal relationship. "Somehow, of course, the life of man and the life of God must be brought together in a single thought; otherwise we shall not understand either ourselves or the divine nature, and without doubt the realization of 'God-with-us' enriches and reinforces our purposes." However the conception of the fatherhood of God may arise, once it has been experienced by the individual, it cannot help having an influence on his human relationships. That our human relationships and evaluations have much to do with the particular idea of God we hold cannot be doubted, and points to the way whereby educational method may enrich the child's thought of God.

---

[5] Coe, George A., *What Is Christian Education?* Problem 17, p. 74 ff. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.

We must approach this problem of education in reverence and respect for personality, just as we do every other aspect of our task—through the experience of the learner. As soon as he is born, the child begins to experience social relations and contacts with others. At first his range of contacts is limited and the society in which he lives is small. Gradually, however, other persons than those in his immediate family begin to touch his life. More and more frequent and varied become these contacts, until he bursts the bonds which have confined him to the one society of the family and becomes a member of other groups. So he grows, through enlarging experience in a world of persons.

These human contacts yield the situations through which respect and love for others may be developed. Our educational setting is that of active persons learning to live in society. Morality is a matter of social living which expresses the respect and love which one holds toward the personalities of others. Education for love begins where the learner's life touches his neighbor, and finds its success in the ethical quality of the responses growing out of such contacts. Our purpose becomes that of assisting growing persons to adjust themselves to their new social relations in a Christian way and helping them to live in the consciousness that all these persons with whom they come in touch are children in God's family. The curriculum of religious education will consist of these experiences of relationship with other human personalities together with such methods and materials as will make such contacts more meaningful and the outcome more nearly Christian.

The basis for understanding, sympathy, and love of other persons lies in shared activity in the pursuit of common purposes. This is what makes the family the most potent educational institution, though unhappily this community of effort in common purposes is in too many families unrealized. It is what makes the church group, the gang, the community contacts, so important educationally.

All the means by which learning takes place are active in building children's attitudes toward other persons. Most powerful among these is the influence of suggestion. Unloving attitudes in the group of which the learner is a member will be reflected in his own attitudes just as surely as will wholesome attitudes. Thus are the unwholesome attitudes of parents toward neighbors, servants, or others reflected in their children. It has been demonstrated that race prejudices are largely caught by children from their elders.[6] Effort directed toward making every family a little Christian community will be well spent educationally. The church society which lives the goodwill it professes should be the richest possible soil in which to grow loving persons! The indirect educational values of press, stage, and screen in molding the attitudes of persons toward other personalities are beyond calculation.

2. *To guide growing persons in the interpretation of life in the social order in terms of religious ideals.* If social situations and their interpretation can be seen as not separate from but continuous with the individual's life with God, religious idealism will be effective in modern life. To ground the child in the understanding that religion is life, and to establish him in conduct meet to this understanding, is one of the chief aims in teaching religion.

The consciousness of the common fatherhood of God should make a difference in social living. It should make every Christian conscious of the needs of others and his own responsibility for doing what he can for the well-being of all. It should lead him to identify the highest social well-being with the will of God, and lead him out in joyous self-giving to that ideal. It should lead him to the realization of that enlargement of character which comes from sharing in a common purpose. It should show him clearly that "I cannot go alone either toward or away from the kingdom, for it is my relation to some one else, a relation of help or of hindrance, that determines the direction that my own character is taking." [7]

---

[6] See Lasker, Bruno, *Race Attitudes in Children,* chapter viii. Henry Holt & Co., 1929.

The need of modern society for religion, if it is to be saved, has been emphasized frequently. Many would agree with Bower that "With the deeper insights into the nature of religion that are coming with modern psychology and sociology, there is emerging a conviction on the part of many careful thinkers that modern society requires for its soundness, its integration, and its motivation that which only religion can give. These demands of the modern world lay upon religious education an urgent responsibility which it must recognize and accept to the full." [8] Moreover, it is questioned whether a righteous society can emerge without the motivation of religion. "A progressing *society must depend upon religion for the drive, the motivation*, of progress. Society must look to science for the technic of progress, and to ethics for the moral criticism of ends and means; it must look to the spiritualized will for the drive that will give it purpose and propulsive power."[9]

---

[7] Coe, George A., *A Social Theory of Religious Education*, p. 6. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917.

[8] Bower, William C., *The Curriculum of Religious Education*, p. 114. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.

Religious education which seeks to lead growing persons into active effort in building the kingdom must lay stress on the ultimate spiritual unity of the family of God. That religion has not always been this integrating force, but has often served to divide rather than to unite, is unfortunately true. When such conflicts arise because a part of the group has sensed the impelling influence of the religious ideal and cannot refuse to be disobedient to the heavenly vision, then it is but a natural consequence of our desire for better things, and should be recognized as a way to progress. But most religious divisions are not on a basis of higher or lower living, but on sectarian differences. In many communities the strongest dividing factor is religion. In many families there is dissension over questions of religion. All too often the conflict in families is resolved by eliminating religion itself, but this is hardly a satisfactory solution. That men and women who are actively seeking a Christian human brotherhood will tolerate our sectarian divisiveness must be a

[9] Bower, William C., *The Educational Task of the Local Church*, pp. 28, 29. Front Rank Press, 1921.

constant marvel to one who is not so immersed in the system that he cannot see beyond it. This internal weakness of Christianity is one of the most serious problems to which religious education must give its attention.

The failure of religion to recognize its social responsibilities is written large in its own hymn-books. Any typical hymnal will reveal a preponderance of hymns expressing personal aspiration and piety, and only a very small per cent giving form and expression to the great currents of social aspiration. Only in recent years has there been a gradual shifting of emphasis. If religion is to become dynamic in social progress, our hymns must inspire to action in the cause of the coming kingdom.

Before closing our discussion on religion as a means of social control, we must give a thought to the place of worship in this process. We cannot do better than to quote a brief section from the writings of one of our ten leaders in religious education who has given a great deal of attention to the study of worship:

> Worship thus becomes a means of social control, for it serves to cultivate and revitalize in the individual the appreciation of objects which in its best moments society has come to regard as one of the highest value.
>
> But worship may be a factor in social progress as well as social control. A natural consequence of the nature of the

religious consciousness and its means of renewal is that it becomes or may become through its forms of expression, a means of inspiration for practical effort. And this in two ways. In the first place, as new items of experience are lifted into consciousness out of the milieu of custom; as new habits of life develop; as new attitudes to life and new ideas emerge; these come to be considered from the point of view of the supreme value, personality. . . .

In the second place, the experience of worship itself, with its elevation of idea and feeling, its contemplation of the best in life, is a state of mind which is pregnant with fresh effort in new directions. New levels of moral control are attained. New ideas are grasped and new causes espoused. The will of the individual, perhaps weak and ineffective by itself, is reinforced by the purposes of others. The broken resolve is once more taken up into its place in an organized life-purpose, which worship recreates.[10]

3. *To develop in growing persons the ability and disposition to participate in the life of society under Christian ideals.* Un-Christian as present society may be, the individual will not bring about better conditions by withdrawing from it. He must live and move in society. It should be his constant endeavor to meet the situations arising in this social life in the most Christian way. Beyond this, we must look to the Christian to share creatively in building a better society. This second aspect of our objective we shall discuss in the next section, not because the two are separate in life, but for the sake of seeing

---

[10] Hartshorne, Hugh, *Worship in the Sunday School*, pp. 22, 23. Teachers College.

more clearly the two aspects of the social implications of Christian living.

Religious education must assume that the only kind of life which a growing person will live is a social life. If religion is to be effective in life, then it must have an influence upon the social situations in which a person comes to self-realization. Our emphasis in religion today is that it shall not be simply something added to the everyday life of the individual, but that it shall permeate and influence all the relations and functions in which he finds himself. A religion which is worth having is one which will give new meaning and insight to the individual as he meets the problems of everyday living. In this sense religion may be said to undergird moral conduct with divine sanctions.

It may be said, to the everlasting glory of the human race, that the vision of what is to be is always far in advance of what is. To some the glorious perfection toward which the human race should strive is so far removed from the present that in discouragement they lose touch with the present. Let us not relinquish in one iota our ideal for the coming kingdom. On the other hand, let us teach growing persons that they need not wait for the millennium to come before they can live as religious beings. The abundant life may be begun here and now, and is begun just as soon as religion takes vital hold of the individual's life.

The educational task which concerns us is one of leading growing persons to see the religious meaning and implications of the situations which they meet from day to day. The highest good is not always crystal clear. Many situations are so complex that they require study, analysis, and the weighing of various values. Moreover, granting that we may determine clearly what is the highest possible response which may be made in any situation, there needs further to be the dynamic which will carry high purposes into actual accomplishments.

Here again the place of experience in the educational process must be recognized. We may begin by describing the kingdom. We may demonstrate by science and logic that the Christian society is the best society. We will, however, secure the commitment of persons to the Christian society only by giving them actual experience in living in a Christian society. We must provide the conditions under which growing lives may share in a spiritual social order, so that every child may grow up in a Christian society. When we succeed in providing the conditions under which every child may grow up as a member of a Christian society, and never think of any other society as desirable or possible, then good will and love will follow as a natural consequence from his experience. Hartshorne has pointed out that—

> In order that this development of the individual may take place, society must provide for every child:
>
> a. A community dominated by the spirit of brotherhood, whose individual, coöperative and institutional activities in worship, work and fellowship he may imitate and share.
>
> b. Within this community, definite training for skill in these activities, and in their intelligent direction and control through study and discussion.[11]

4. *To guide growing persons to whole-hearted participation in bringing about constructive advancement toward the ideal of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.* The social group which is living and growing must undergo a continuous reconstruction as the forms and usages of the present are passing into history and the vision of the future is coming into being. Religious education which expresses its goals in terms of the democracy of God must be concerned that there be a constant trend toward this ideal. If it is to be dynamic and lead to the progressive achievement of objectives in a Christian social order, it cannot be merely a process whereby ancient standards are transmitted, but it must have a part in the revision of standards them-

---

[11] From *Childhood and Character*, p. 6, by Hugh Hartshorne. Copyright, 1919. Used by permission of The Pilgrim Press.

selves. Of the educational function expressing itself in the reconstruction of society, Cope says:

> The personal and social aim . . . seeks to develop in children those Christian attitudes and purposes which will make them intelligent coöperators in the Christian program, the program of Jesus for humanity. . . . It seeks to develop persons who never will be content with less than the united hearts the hope of the city of God throughout the world. It loving family of God for all men everywhere. It sets in their gives them a purpose large enough to quicken their hearts, to satisfy all their aspirations and engage all their powers.[12]

The position at which we have arrived is that if religion is to exert a critical function it must not simply reveal a perfect goal, but also evaluate the present in terms of its distance from that goal. Far from being a palliative in making existing conditions bearable, religion must serve as an irritant, allowing us never to be at rest with what is, but always urging us forward to a better which is to be. To this end religious education must not be satisfied simply with information and skill which will bring about adjustment to the present, but it must much more help growing persons to keep desirable ends in view, and to face the problems of today in the light of the achievement of such ends. An ideal of the coming Kingdom, dissatisfaction with the present, and a God-given energy directed toward the achievement of higher values and motivated by an infinite love—these are the outcomes of a Christian education adequate to our generation. "Thus education is not only society's supreme act of self-preservation; it is also society's most sincere judgment upon its own defects, and its supreme effort at self-improvement." [13]

---

[12] Cope, Henry F., "Missionary Education Bad and Otherwise," in *The Church School,* February, 1922, p. 215.

> Whether religion is backward-looking or forward-looking will depend entirely upon the values around which it is organized. If it is organized around the values of the past, it will be backward-looking, static. If it is organized around the unrealized values of the future it will be forward-looking. How it shall be organized is primarily the function of religious education to determine. The experience curriculum is fitted to organize the religion of the present and future around the great ideals and values that, when realized, will mean the realization of the kingdom of God. [14]

There is a peculiar contribution which the young can make to the realization of our highest social ideals. It is they who are most capable of growing, most able to see things in a fresh light, most dynamic to direct their energies toward the vision which is theirs. Education has too long been an effort to shape the minds of the young to conform with the patterns laid out by the more mature members of the race. We have never yet realized what may happen if the aim of education becomes, not conformity, but an introduction of the young to the ideals which are cherished by the race and the very imperfect attempts which have been made to realize those ideals, leaving to them the problem of further progress toward their realization. Under this kind of education: "The 'message' of Christianity to youth will assume a different tone, and it will have a different content. . . . It will concern the unfinished and unbegun tasks of Christianity; it will treat Christianity itself as unfinished; it will include a criticism of current life as drastic as that which Jesus meted out to his own times; and it will offer the church as the part of modern society in which young and old have greater opportunity and incitement than anywhere else for coöperative self-determination in the most weighty matters." [15]

---

[13] Coe, George A., *A Social Theory of Religious Education*, p. 18. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917.

[14] Bower, William C., *The Curriculum of Religious Education*, p. 258. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.

The test of the kind of religious education which we have here described is nothing less than a changed social order, trending toward the ideal of the Kingdom. How different is this test from that applied in our prevailing practice, as described in the following quotation: "Instead of being taught to work directly on the ideal of changing attitudes in the crusade for righteous living, the teacher spends most of his energy on transferring materials from himself to his pupil. His test of results is not found in the uncontrolled and unsupervised conduct of the pupil in the vitality of living—the only valid test—but in his ability to offer sentence prayers, to repeat from the Bible, and take part in church activities." [16]

---

[15] Coe, George A., *What Ails Our Youth?* p. 92. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.

Modern youth has often been criticized because of lack of conformity to adult standards. Much has been made of the revolt of youth. Such unrest and such revolt as there may be has resulted largely from the apparent superfluity and unimportance of many of the things to which conformity was desired. What a pity that this spirit of evaluation should ever be dormant! What a regret that this critical spirit should not be directed toward the basic ideals by which present activities and customs might be judged and reconstructed into more permanent values. Coe is no doubt right in maintaining that the supreme corrective of the ailments of modern youth is a constant participation with God and fellow men in the creation of a new order of society.

---

[16] Artman, Joseph M., and Jacobs, J. A., "A Survey of Recent Tendencies in Adult Education in the United States and Their Significance for Religious Education," in *Religious Education*, November, 1927, pp. 969, 970.

This is not a time for us to deplore youth's apparent rejection of the Christian message for the world, but rather a time to give them an opportunity to try working out this message in human society, no matter where it may lead:

> To inculcate general sentiments, even to suffuse them with the glow of love for God and loyalty to Jesus, is not, as history shows, to insure insight into the actualities of the *status quo*, much less reconstructive activity. The reason for the social ineffectiveness of such merely generalized teaching of ideals or sentiments is psychologically understandable. . . . It lacks provision for looking ahead, seeing what sort of changes are needed, and taking the initiative in them; and it tends to substitute sentimental good will for vigorous action.[17]

It is unnecessary to point out that in our modern life there are many social problems which are baffling our best efforts toward solution. "The present confusion of ideals and values supplies no common ground on which men may meet to resolve their difficulties, no accepted standards to which they may appeal in the adjustment of conflict. In a world that has achieved physical unity, division marks the minds of men. Over a stout barrier of ignorance, prejudice, and misunderstanding, each guarding with jealous and watchful eye its own narrow interests, Labor faces Capital, Youth faces Age, Pagan faces Christian, Black faces White, East faces West. No body of ethical principles or common interpretation of life exists to which the various races and peoples, classes and sects, swear fealty and own allegiance. The development of such a spiritual heritage out of the wealth of materials at hand should be the first task of the educator."[18]

---

[17] Coe, George A., *What Ails Our Youth?* p. 49. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.

That religious education, in setting itself the task of social reconstruction, faces an enormous undertaking is evident from a brief glance at some of the problems which today are begging for solution.

What, for example, shall be done with the question of war? Public opinion is gathering increasing momentum for the abolition of war from the face of the earth. It is to be doubted, however, whether this sentiment is yet deep enough to withstand such a crisis as might be occasioned by a national insult (fancied or real). Our efforts are based on a program of negative abolition rather than a positive reëducation in good will which should make war impossible. The seeds of war are still in the soil, ready to spring up and flourish as soon as the conditions are favorable. Here is a major task for religious education.

---

[18] Chapman, J. C., and Counts, G. S., *Principles of Education*, p. 354, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

What shall be done with the problems arising out of our undue national pride? To what extent is it true that the flag representing the Kingdom of God may, in the hearts of Christian people, fly above the flag of any country? What, in short, should be the Christian's attitude toward the state? Have we the courage and consecration to do according to Coe's declaration: "Religious education has its charter and constitution in the ancient saying, 'We must obey God rather than men.' . . . Physically the state includes me, but spiritually I include the state."[19]

Again, take the question of our economic order. No one would deny that in many respects the way in which we have developed industrially is inimical to the highest interests of personality development. Yet who will say how industry should be reorganized in order to assure a condition which we might freely describe as Christian?

Continue this rehearsal of our social problems through that of family life, poverty, crime, the race question, and in each case we must conclude that we are face to face with issues on which the Christian message has a very distinct bearing, but for which no one in our day has been found wise enough to outline the exact procedure which would yield a Christian outcome.

---

[19] Coe, George A., "Our Two-Headed System of Religious Education," in *Religious Education*, June, 1927, p. 567.

It is not to be pessimistic to admit that this generation will probably not find the complete solution to any of our great social problems. We might even add that no generation will find the complete solution. The ideal will continue to outrun practice. It is important, however, that we recognize that these problems exist, and that we look to the Christian message and program for a way to a better state of affairs. Religious education should deliberately introduce the learner to these social problems. It should help him to take a critical but optimistic attitude toward the social order. It should lead him to exert his utmost influence toward bringing about the ideal condition which we have described as the Kingdom of God. In the immature members of every generation, going forward to self-realization in the society which has not been of their making, we have the greatest hope for the future. Let religious education win their allegiance to the ideal Kingdom with thorough understanding of the problems as they are and the attempts at solution which we have made, and the resulting progress will be nothing short of amazing.

Education generally is in our day assuming a responsibility for social reconstruction. Character and human values are the watchwords of all true teachers. Nevertheless, religious education has its own peculiar contribution to make to the progress of human society. Even as the prophets of old took their stand as radical reformers, so must religion in every day speak in the face of existing conditions with an unmistakable "Thus saith the Lord!" In any system of schools supported by the state it is to be expected that the conservative trends, seeking to stabilize what is, will be dominant. In the face of our greatest social problems, however, a more radical attitude must be taken for the sake of human progress. The school of religion, free from external control, and motivated only by a vision of the Kingdom of God, should serve as a constant reminder of ideals which are still ahead.

5. *To develop in growing persons that large-group consciousness which includes in its scope the entire human family.* In stating this objective, we are seeking to comprehend the full meaning of the fatherhood of God, in its implications for a common social order in which all men are brothers. This has been the burden of the prophetic message of Christendom from its earliest times, that the love of God extends to all his people and that the prin-

ciples of brotherhood must apply throughout the entire Christian family.

There is no time in which this ideal was so pertinent as today. Never before have the interrelations between different peoples been so full and so free. The conditions for establishing a world democracy are at our very door. Intercommunication has been multiplied, cultures are being interchanged, gradually we are coming to a basis of common experience which will enable different peoples to understand one another.

This growing intimacy of the peoples of the world has its dangers and difficulties as well as its hopeful aspects. It has often been the experience of individuals that it is easier to love other races when they are far removed than when they are close at hand. Close association brings about its irritations as well as its opportunities for friendship. Ease of access to one another has heightened the operation of those destructive forces which nations may use against each other as well as the forces which make for greater love. This emphasizes the more the great need today of establishing that human brotherhood which has been the dream of seers and prophets.

Inherent within the work of the Christian church there have always been the elements of a program for teaching world brotherhood. The fatherhood of God has implied such a teaching. The program of missionary education has sought to extend the influence of the church to all parts of the world, and in turn has brought the far ends of the earth into contact with the church at home. In recent years the conception of the meaning of missionary education has broadened, until today it means not so much a certain type of propaganda, to secure personnel and money to carry on a foreign work, but rather an education whereby the teachings of brotherhood may be extended to the ends of the earth. This conception of the missionary aims of the church has made them almost synonymous with religious education, and has served to make both missionary education and religious education more Christian.

> We are led to the staggering, precedent-smashing conception that religious education is properly one of the main agencies for setting the world right—for redressing ancient injustices, removing disabilities, and transforming our self-serving political and economic order into a real brotherhood. . . . The first trail in this direction was blazed when missions and temperance gained a recognized place in Sunday school instruction. There are those among us who would now change this trail into a broad highway. They feel that studies and activities that lead toward the health of the community, removal of causes of poverty, enrichment of community life, the establishment of economic justice and industrial peace, and the cessation of war

may be included in the religious curriculum without impropriety—nay, that they cannot be omitted without impropriety.[20]

The method whereby this large-group consciousness may be taught is again that of experience. The little child is limited in his experience to a very small group. As he grows older this group expands to include other groups. These larger groups again form contacts with still larger groups, until gradually his experience grows to include the immediate community, the larger community, and the nation. It is but another step to guide his experience so that it will grow further to include a still larger group. Into these growing social contacts religious education must pour its Christian interpretations of love and good will.

There is ample ground for believing that he who does not love his neighbor whom he has seen is not likely to love that neighbor whom he has not seen. Missionary education must therefore begin at home. It must seek contacts with those persons in the community who may be representatives of the peoples in other countries with whom it is desired to set up a human contact. It must not simply involve contacts of pity and condescension, but, in so far as possible, coöperation in common tasks. True appreciation of one another will grow out of an experience of one another's motives and purposes. Having done all that we can through direct contacts, this method of teaching must then be supplemented by all those devices whereby the far may be brought near, and the ends of the earth brought in imagination into the very life of the child. Reading, pictures, study, the sharing of culture, the thoughtfulness toward others made possible by gift bags and treasure chests, all of these are available to the use of the educator in expanding the horizon of brotherhood for each growing person.

---

[20] Coe, George A., "Opposing Theories of the Curriculum," in *Religious Education*, April, 1922, p. 146.

We cannot conclude this discussion on the large-group consciousness better than by using the words of Chapman and Counts in describing one of the aims of the school which is fit to meet the needs of our generation:

> The school should strive to give to every child . . . a sense of membership in a universal brotherhood of men; a firm resolve to live in accord with that purpose which moves through the universe to fulfillment; a cheerful acquiescence in the demands for personal sacrifice in the promotion of the greater good; and, finally, a clear perception of and faithful allegiance to that ideal kingdom of peace and good will which for ages has been the hope of man, a kingdom in which justice will "roll down as waters, righteousness as a mighty stream." [21]

[21] Chapman, J. C., and Counts, G. S., *Principles of Education,* p. 362 ff. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

CHAPTER X

CHRISTIAN LIFE PHILOSOPHY AS OBJECTIVE

To lead growing persons to build a life philosophy on the basis of a Christian interpretation of life and the universe.

LIFE demands certain logical patterns by which it may shape itself. Conduct becomes intelligible only when seen in the light of the dominant life motives under which it takes shape. Whether that pattern be rooted in the faith that the greatest thing in the world is love or that the greatest thing is power, whether it conceives of the universe as being friendly to human aspirations or only as an unfeeling mechanism, does make a difference both to individual happiness and to the spirit under which relations with others are lived. Education must find much of its purpose in the pressing need of each individual to adjust himself to the totality of existence. "Students have wondered why it is that in an age of relative material abundance, an age toward which men have striven since the beginning of time, men are not content. The answer

← Also quote
p. 109.

is simple. Without a faith of some sort, without a faith in which men can believe, men cannot live, men must despair. To be tolerable life must seem significant, and to be significant it must lead to some end felt to be of supreme worth."[1]

Bobbitt calls this development of a life philosophy: "Ability to see one's environment, the near and the far, the personal and the impersonal, *sub specie aeternitatis*, as a vast and restless sea of forces and phenomena, infinite in extent, subtlety, and complexity. Ability to see and realize one's inter-relatedness with and within this boundless environment."[2] Religious education would add to this conception a faith that the structure of the universe itself is the expression of the will and purpose of God, and friendly to the achievement and conservation of man's highest values. Bonser maintains that this consciousness of spiritual values will be a natural consequence of seeing the reasonableness of the processes of nature:

> As the children come to realize the presence of an active energy that lies back of every phenomenon of our environment, and at the same time to observe a reign of reasonableness and law in everything that occurs that corresponds to the laws of our own thinking, they will tend to see a spiritual relationship

---

[1] Chapman, J. C., and Counts, G. S., *Principles of Education*, p. 355. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

[2] Bobbitt, Franklin, *How to Make a Curriculum*, p. 26. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

between themselves and this creative power we call God. Somewhere they will begin to feel that there is personality in and through the activities of the world order.[3]

In a universe of law and order, what is the place of a Creator and Sustainer? In a world where the prevailing method of establishing truth is by objective proof, what is to be made of the fact that no scientist has ever been able to prove the existence of God by even the most delicate instruments? There is need here for a clear understanding of the meaning of faith. Nothing but confusion can arise from the assumption that the scientist should be able to discover God. There is no *scientific* proof of the presence of God in the universe. Yet, the fact which eludes the most ardent efforts at objective demonstration may be proven beyond the shadow of a doubt to the inner convictions of the soul. Of such a nature are most of the highest values of life. This leads us, further, to the development of a philosophy of the place and meaning of religion in life. Soares says, concerning this: "Religion is rather a value that is given to all life. It is the experience of accord with beneficent, on-going purpose; it is a feeling of the cosmic quality of righteousness—a faith that this goodly human society that we seek is not merely our little human invention, but is in the very nature of things. It is the confidence that there is a will of God that may be discovered and that may be achieved. Let it be said even once more that this is an attempt to describe, not religion in general, but the religion in which we may bring up our children." [4] Let religious education set itself the task of giving growing persons a clear understanding of what religion is and why men count it as one of their dearest possessions.

---

[3] From the Introduction, by Frederick G. Bonser, to *The Golden Rule City*, p. x, by Edna Madison Bonser. Copyright, 1927. Used by permission of The Pilgrim Press.

1. *To guide growing persons in the interpretation of the universe in the light of their faith in the power and purpose of God.* From the manifestations of beauty and order, as well as of beneficent purpose, religious man has concluded that God is imminent in his world and expressing himself through creation. This in turn has had a reciprocal effect on his understanding of the world itself. If it is God's creation and expressive of his spirit, then it is a place full of beauty and joy.

> To the religious mind this world is rendered at once more subtle and complex and yet more unified by the fact that at its center is a Supreme Person the impress of whose thought and purpose is to be detected in the intelligence and orderliness of the world, and who is creating and achieving his purposes on a field of history of vast distances and duration. To this central

---

[4] Soares, Theodore G., *Religious Education*, p. 234. Reprinted by permission of the University of Chicago Press, 1928.

> Reality adjustment must also be made, not as an addition to all other adjustments, but as a permeating and conditioning factor in every adjustment to nature and man.[5]

To be sure, this religious interpretation of the world leads into many difficulties. No amount of faith or reason can close our eyes to the fact that there are many maladjustments. While it may be true that to the vast majority the world offers more of joy than of pain, it is also true that to some the reverse is the case. To this problem the Christian man responds with the faith that in spite of all its imperfections this world is yet the best possible world.

Education which is for the development of personality cannot help but concern itself with teaching something concerning the ultimate structure and purpose of the world in which we live. This world furnishes the normal environment in which everyone, physically speaking, is placed. It presents a constant riddle of which every thinking man must demand an interpretation. We must agree with Chapman and Counts that "If man were privileged to ask of an infinite mind one question, and only one, with the assurance that it would be truthfully and completely answered, what riddle would he propound? . . . He would want to know something of the forces that lie at the heart of the world and determine its destiny. He would ask, perhaps: Is the universe friendly? Is there a purpose working itself out in the world of nature and in the lives of men? Does this purpose recognize moral distinctions, or does it merely discern differences in size and distinguish strength from weakness? Does it manifest a deep oblivion of the laws of right and wrong? Is it beyond good and evil? Do the thoughts and feelings and actions of men obstruct or facilitate the realization of this purpose, or are they but the impotent sparks that fly from the anvil of the forces of creation? On the answer to this question rests in large measure the significance of life; and every man must answer it, if not through taking thought, at least in the life that he lives." [6] Coupled with this statement of the educational opportunity, let us quote further from these authors their conception of what the school should do to meet this opportunity:

---

[5] Bower, W. C., "The Curriculum as Enriched and Controlled Experience," in *The Journal of Religion*, October, 1927, p. 508.

> The school should strive to give to every child the ability to see that the natural environment "as a vast and restless sea of forces and phenomena, infinite in number, extent, subtlety, and complexity"; a faith in the benevolence of the cosmic order toward those who seek to understand and conform to its laws; a feeling of intimate kinship with nature and the whole of the

---

[6] Chapman, J. C., and Counts, G. S., *Principles of Education*, p. 333 ff. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

> phenomenal world; a lifelong wonder in the presence of the marvelous manifestations of life and nature; a conviction that the feelings, sufferings, and aspirations of men are weighed in the scales of the forces of creation; . . . a feeling of deep security in the future which lies beyond the grave; a habit of thoughtful meditation on the meaning and value of life; an eagerness to engage in the eternal quest for the True, the Beautiful, and the Good.[7]

Sooner or later, in the experience of growing persons, the problem of God's working in a world of natural law will present itself. Religious teaching in the past has made the road particularly difficult at this point. Our text materials have consisted of a literature which arose in a prescientific age. It is not surprising that in a day when natural law was an unknown concept natural phenomena were interpreted as miracles brought about by direct acts of God. Miracles have also been used as proof of the faith that God can and does enter human life for the sake of human welfare. Thus the defense of the validity of records of happenings which are contradictory to the known laws of science has become, in effect, a defense of Christian faith. The spirit in which such religious education is given is laudable, but the result is often deplorable. It is unfortunate that young people should be forced into the dilemma of choosing between the authority of science and the authority of religious tradition. Is there not a conception of God which may include both viewpoints, which makes him the author of natural law and thus puts the scientist in the position of thinking God's thoughts after him rather than that of dislodging God from his honored position? We should allow Kilpatrick to remind us that "increasingly religion will base itself, in the words of Sabatier, not on the authority either of book or of church, but of the 'spirit,' the way it works when we try it. If so, it behooves all who believe in 'spiritual' values to found them on this rock of experience and not on the sands of tradition, however hallowed this may be by association."[8]

---

[7] Chapman, J. C., and Counts, G. S., *Principles of Education*, p. 262 ff. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

This problem is part of the larger problem of religious adjustment in a world of science. It is not our purpose here to discuss the relation of religion and science, and the relative stability of the position of each. We shall assume that there is no essential conflict, but that religion as a world-view has room in its interpretation of life and the universe for science as well as other human interests. What we are concerned about is the tragic result of this *seeming* conflict, and the inability of religious educators to cope with it. Here is a field for religious education if ever there was one! Unless religion can be made a growing experience, interpreting and sustaining life at all stages of its expanding horizons, providing a philosophy of life which includes science in its scope even before the problems of conflict arise, then religious education has fallen short of its highest objectives. Religious education through the experience of the pupil is far more difficult than religious education as the transmission of a culture, but it is the only kind of education which has the slightest hope of issuing in the life abundant.

---

[8] Kilpatrick, W. H., "Thinking in Childhood and Youth," in *Religious Education*, February, 1928, p. 140.

Religious education which endeavors to give a working philosophy of life must be clear in its placement of spiritual values above the material. In an age when mechanical invention is the most prominent achievement, we must pause to inquire whether all our material progress has really yielded a corresponding progress in the things of the spirit. It behooves us to raise the problem of greatest values, and if these are found to lie clearly in the realm of spiritual things, to set about finding ways to enthrone spiritual values in the hearts of men. In evaluating our values we shall be in no danger of losing our perspective if we follow the life philosophy of Jesus.

The way of life which seems to us good is Jesus' way of life, and we believe in that way of life, not simply because he believed in it and practiced it and it commands our admiration, but because we have faith that he knew what he was about, and we believe that the structure of the universe itself is such as he told us. We have faith in the kind of God who is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and it is the function of religious education to make effective in the lives of children that revelation of the character of God which is the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.[9]

Our material progress cannot but spell ruin unless this increasing control of natural forces can be animated by a spirit of good will which sets its objectives in the fruits of the spirit. Of the necessity for this spiritual interpretation of life, Chapman and Counts have said, "refusal to place the secular interests in the wider setting which transcends the bounds of sense and the limits of exact knowledge, is as unsatisfying and superficial as that primitive cosmology which accounted for the stability of the earth by assuming it to rest on the back of an elephant which in turn was supported by a tortoise."[10]

2. *To lead growing persons to the achievement of a faith in the validity and ultimate conservation of life's highest values.* When God created man, he placed within him an urge which has led him con-

---

[9] Weigle, Luther A., "What Is Religious Education?" in *International Journal of Religious Education*, p. 25, June, 1926.

[10] Chapman, J. C., and Counts, G. S., *Principles of Education*, p. 330. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

tinuously to sense and pursue higher values. As long as this sensitiveness is awake, he always conceives what *is* to be less than what *ought to be*. A moral consciousness pervades all his relationships, awakening in him a sense of *ought* toward the conduct recognized to be the right.

This sensitiveness to higher values raises one of life's fundamental problems. Is it grounded in the eternal constitution of the universe itself, or is it but a delusion without ultimate meaning? Mechanistic and materialistic philosophy would not hesitate to say the latter. Christian faith has taken a firm stand on the former.

It is an essential element of the Christian faith that the fatherhood of God implies an obligation of each toward his fellow personalities, which will make for the mutual highest good. This is what we mean when we speak of religious sanctions for moral conduct. This does not mean that the introduction of God into human situations is to supply a "big stick" through which the desired outcome may be compelled, but rather that religion adds a new element to human relations which requires a complete shift in point of view.

This conception of the Christian interpretation of moral conduct has the most significant implications for religious education. "The full life of education and the full life of religion are bound up with one another. Education remains defective and falls short of its full end if it fails to beget the loyalty to eternal principles, the good will, the creative responsibility which enter into the making of moral character; and moral character is most surely established only when it is undergirded and sustained by a faith that the constitution of the universe itself is moral, and that moral values are therefore eternal. That faith, that conviction, is religion."[11] It is here that the distinction between moral education and religious education lies. It is on this foundation that we may build with confidence our faith that religious education must have a place of primary importance in any plan for bringing about the highest good in social life. It is this essential quality which converts a secular democracy into the Kingdom of God. This conviction comes to the clearest expression in the writings of Weigle, and we cannot do better than add to the above quotation a few more typical statements from his writings:

> Religious education is more than moral education, because religious education is motivated by a fundamental conviction respecting the structure of the universe itself and a fundamental faith in the character of a personal, living God, which is more

---

[11] Weigle, Luther A., "What Is Religious Education?" in *International Journal of Religious Education,* June, 1926, p. 25.

than any mere statement of rules of living or laws of human obligation. . . . We have not passed beyond the bounds of morality and into the life of religion until we have reached a faith that the structure of the universe itself is the expression of the will and purpose of the living God; and it is the supreme function of religious education so to reveal the universe to children that they shall understand that beneath them and about them there is this loving purpose and power of God. That, I say, is the challenge to the churches, so to reveal God and his purpose to children that they shall acquire that deepest and most lasting of all human motives.[13]

The religious education which is the aim of the Christian Church is not something less, but *more*, than moral education. It becomes misleading if it conveys the impression that this *more* is a matter of simple addition, and that religious education differs from moral education only in the sense that God is one more person to be taken into account and that eternity is an infinite extension of time. The Christian ethics is indissolubly bound up with the Christian metaphysics; or better, in Christianity ethics and metaphysics are organically interdependent. Christianity is a way of life which is grounded in a way of conceiving the universe—Jesus' way of life, rooted in Jesus' way of conceiving God and the world. The recognition of the presence and power of God in the world of nature and in the life of men makes a difference at every point. Nothing is quite the same as it would be without him. The Christian religion infuses a new motive and spirit into the whole of moral education. It introduces a new perspective and range into the materials of knowledge and moral judgment; its appeal to the powers of appreciation, affection, and desire is incomparably stronger, richer, and deeper; and it assures to him who is

---

[13] Weigle, Luther A., "What Is Religious Education?" in *International Journal of Religious Education*, June, 1926, p. 25.

> striving for self-control and moral strength the backing of the universe; it renders available and effective the power and grace of God.[13]
>
> If the public schools must teach that right is merely what men have agreed upon, nothing more than convention, or fashion, or public opinion, or legal enactment by a majority in some legislatures—if they are estopped from saying that some things are right because we believe them to be rooted in the constitution of the universe itself, expressions of the nature and will of God—then we are in the presence of a new danger.[14]

No consideration of the building of a Christian life philosophy is complete without some attention to the problem of evil. The fact that there is sin, sorrow, disappointment, and pain in the world will sooner or later be faced by every person. Why do the righteous suffer? Why is the upright father of a family shot down in a robbery while his assassin remains at large? Why does a devout and useful man come to a lingering death with cancer? Why must life be sacrificed to provide food so that other life may be sustained? These are but a few questions which indicate that all is not right with the world. We have been too prone to disregard the fact of evil in the religious education of our children. Worse still, we have sometimes taught a philosophy of suffering which was outgrown when the Book of Job was written. The consequence has been that our sheltered and protected and miseducated children have at some time in life come suddenly face to face with this awful monster of evil, and their foundations of faith and insight have been too insecure to stand the shock. Faith has been snuffed out in the face of the seeming contradiction between the painfully real facts of life and the picture of an ideal universe dominated by the loving will of God. The finite mind has been unable to find an entirely satisfactory answer to the problem of evil. There is decided gain, however, in leading growing persons to face the problem from all angles in the light of the contributions toward a solution which have been made by our best thinkers. The growing person should be encouraged to make his own creative contribution to this unsolved problem.

---

[13] Weigle, Luther A., *The Teaching Work of the Church*, pp. 41, 42. Association Press.

[14] Weigle, Luther A., in *Christianity and Social Adventuring*, edited by Jerome Davis. The Century Company, 1927, p. 269.

3. *To guide growing persons in the discovery and adoption of a Christian interpretation of the problem of continuity of personality in life after the death of the physical body.* In dealing with the problem of immortality we are facing one of the primary elements of religious faith. Christian religious education cannot refuse to give due consideration to this question as it seeks to build up a life philosophy.

What has the religious school of the past had to offer at this point? The annual teaching of the Easter lesson with its risen Christ illustrated with stories of caterpillars and dragonflies, the assumption that of course everybody believes in immortality, with dire imprecations heaped upon the pupil who would so much as question this belief—has not this been the extent of the teaching in the average Sunday school? Of frankly facing the question with its pros and cons there has been very little.

Our indirect education concerning immortality has been more effective than our direct efforts. The child has been reared in an atmosphere where this belief was a foregone conclusion. He has been immersed in a church life which in hymn, prayer, and exhortation positively assumed the validity of this faith. Such contact with death (of human beings) as he has had has been surrounded with the confidence that if a man die, he shall live again. A foundation for faith has been laid in this early experience, and where doubt has crept in it has been either because the mind has been unable to grasp the significance of the teaching, or has passed to the point in maturity where things once accepted on authority must be submitted to reason.

That the percentage of persons who believe in life after death is each year decreasing has been demonstrated by every study made on this question. This is no doubt due to such causes as a spirit of criticism of traditional beliefs, larger opportunity for exposure to the literature of agnosticism, failure of the school of religion to deal adequately with the question. Questions of this sort are not settled by popular vote, and a diminishing number of believers is no evidence for or against the truth, though it must be admitted to have a powerful suggestive influence. What the facts reveal is a woeful need for a more adequate religious education.

What then shall we teach concerning life after death? Let us remember that we are not in the realm of scientifically proved fact, but in the realm of faith. As true educators we cannot do more than lead growing persons into the problems involved, acquaint them with the ways in which this faith has manifested itself in the long line of Christian history, recount the reasons for faith in life after death and the arguments used on the other side, and give our own statement of the faith which is in us. Beyond this we must grant to each learner the right to interpret in his own way the data presented, and to answer the question for himself. Respect for his personality will not permit us to allow him a lesser share in building his own faith.

What then shall we do with the long period of early life before the time of doubt, criticism, and self-determination arrives? Shall we make it a period of neutral educational value as far as this great question is concerned, by carefully refraining from all reference to it? Our answer must be that it cannot be neutral. There will be education either of a positive or a negative character. We would maintain the right of every family and every church to expose its children to the best which it knows, letting criticism, if criticism there must be, come in its own due season. If this be a plea for "indoctrination," let those who align themselves against a positive note in religious education make the most of it!

CHAPTER XI

THE CHURCH AS OBJECTIVE

To develop in growing persons the ability and disposition to participate in the organized society of Christians —the church.

IN THIS discussion we shall think of the church both in the broad sense, as including all organized Christianity, and in the narrow sense as a specific local organization to which the individual member sustains a relation. We are assuming without discussion that Christianity, if it is to fulfill its purpose for the world, needs an institution through which it may be made effective.

As has already been pointed out, in this and the following major objective we are studying means rather than ultimate ends of religious education. Effective membership in a church implies that there are certain other values to which this will be incidental. Similarly, a mastery of the religious culture of the race implies that certain values are to be attained thereby. It is perhaps because of this instrumental function of the church that religious educators have laid less stress upon this as an objective than upon some of those which have previously been discussed. Nevertheless, the aim of good churchmanship is sufficiently prominent in the literature of religious education to justify our giving a place to the church in our outline of objectives. So vital is the church to the well-being of religious life in any generation that no hesitancy should be felt in stating churchmanship as one of our major objectives.

We have called the religious school "the school of the church" but how little it has done to perpetuate the church's own life and efficiency! It may be said of the school of religion that it has been *in* the church but not *of* the church. Yet, if the church has a mission to fulfill, how important it is that we prepare members who shall by training and disposition be able to carry forward that mission. The church fosters religious education in order that religious living may become effective, but religious education in turn must serve the church in making it a more effective institution for religious living in the community.

Education by association and participation has been recognized as the most effective method of teaching. Education in churchmanship offers one of the finest opportunities for using this natural approach. From his earliest infancy the child in a Christian family has a contact with the church. He literally grows up in the church society. His religious education is surrounded by the church, and on every hand he has contact with this organized expression of Christianity. How perfectly simple it should be, therefore, to induct him into the life of the church and help him to find happy self-realization therein.

A few quotations from our religious education leaders will serve as a setting for our further discussion:

> Our purpose, as we have seen, is that children may learn the life of a Christian society, the life of social good will, of love. Now, how does anyone learn such a life? The answer is very simple: *persons learn the life of love by living in a society that loves and in which they have enlarging opportunities of loving.* That is exactly what every church ought to be to all children. It ought to be the family of the Christian love, the step from the smaller home family, where they learn to love, toward the yet larger world family in which all men will love when our great prayer is answered.[1]

> The educational work of the Christian Church includes . . . the lifting of the Christian life above the level of habit and custom to the level of intelligence. This includes the intelligent understanding of the Church's own convictions, as these are grounded in the life and teachings of Jesus; the

---

[1] Cope, H. F., *Organizing the Church School*, p. 32. George H. Doran Company, 1923.

> discovery of new truth and the understanding of the witness of the Spirit in the life of today; the application of Christian principles to the ever-new problems of changing civilization; the training of church members to render intelligent and effective service in the various fields of their opportunity; and the creation and maintenance among folk generally of a sound, true, and effective public opinion.[2]

> Religious education may therefore have its own specific aims, which may be expressed as follows: 1. Fellowship in the life of the religious group, sharing its practices, its worship (involving its functional scriptures, its prayers, its hymnody), its ideas, its hopes, its ideals, its moral purposes. 2. Purpose and ability to criticize the life of the religious group with reference to its contribution to the socialization of all life. The result of this criticism is to make the higher socialization, thus conceived, effective within the possibilities of the learner.[3]

> A third consideration lies in the fact that immature persons are being prepared to take their places in a specialized Christian institution, a social community of like-minded persons, known as the church. This institution is, in a special sense, the custodian of the ideals and purposes of the Kingdom of God.[4]

In religious education the church holds the most valuable instrument both for the advancement of its program and for its own development and well-being. Professor Betts has pointed out that "By this method there can be built up in the young a set of ideals, interests, loyalties, devotions, an understanding and experience of religion, a vision of Christianity that will insure the spiritual quality of the church. By this method such achievements as these can be made possible: 1. Double the church's membership in proportion to population within two decades. 2. Reduce the need for adult reclamation and multiply a hundredfold the effective outcome of funds and effort devoted to church work. 3. Give the church a vitalized spiritual life by building religion firmly into the everyday character and experience of its people. 4. Make it possible for the church to take the offensive for the spiritual regeneration of our own land and the world."[5]

---

[2] Weigle, Luther A., *Report on American Education for Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work at Stockholm*, p. 2.

[3] Soares, Theodore G., *Religious Education*, p. xvii. Reprinted by permission of The University of Chicago Press, 1928.

[4] Bower, W. C., *The Curriculum of Religious Education*, p. 230. Charles Scribner's Sons.

1. *To guide growing persons into intelligent, active, and efficient membership in the Christian church.* We have in mind in this first division of our objective the service rendered toward the maintenance of the church as such. A discussion of participation in the church's outgoing program of service will follow as the next division. Religious education should assume that the learner is or will be a member in some organized expression of Christianity, just as general education assumes citizenship as one

---

[5] From *The Curriculum of Religious Education*, by George H. Betts, p. 307. Copyright, 1924. Used by permission of The Abingdon Press.

of its goals. Unless such an outcome in church membership follows as a free choice of the pupil in consequence of his education in religion, it is to be doubted whether education has succeeded in either its personal or its social aim, for church relationship should be the expression of alignment with the interests of the kingdom.

The act of joining the church constitutes a strategic educational opportunity. Why do people take the vows of membership? What do the vows mean? What difference does it make whether we are members in the church or not? These are questions which every growing boy and girl should eagerly seek to answer. It is unfortunately true that in current practice entrance into the church is often made so formal, and a matter of so little moment, that children and young people need scarcely give a thought to the step which they are taking except as they know that it is a matter looked upon with favor by the group in which they move. Membership in the church should stand for something so distinctive that everyone who has assumed this responsibility would shape his very life by the ideals which it represents.

What are the qualities in church membership which religious education should seek to create? We should demand that membership in the church imply the giving of self. Too often it has been identified simply with the giving of substance. A few people are depended upon to do the work of the church without an attempt to require some personal service from everyone, but if anyone fails to give monetary support his standing is questioned. Yet if the purpose of the church is not simply self-perpetuation, but the enlargement and enrichment of personalities, is it not much more important that membership in the church imply self-giving in a cause for which the church stands? Unless the individual can identify himself with the purpose of the Christian church in the world, and feel surging through him by virtue of his membership a great loyalty to Christ and his kingdom, formal membership in the church for him will mean very little.

Present practice in church organization makes the lay membership largely responsible for the welfare of the church and its program. Comparatively few churches maintain an employed leadership, outside of the minister. There has been an assumption that the very responsibility involved in carrying forward the work of the church is a matter of Christian discipline which has no little educational value. The truth in this position must be admitted. Since educational results are achieved through activity, and what we do is to a large extent a determining factor in what we are, activity in behalf of the Christian program represented by the church should be one of the best agencies of Christian education. Yet on this score the average church presents a very sad condition. What should be a vital opportunity for service to all members of the organization becomes instead a privilege or a burden, as the case may be, for a selected few. The great numbers escape responsibility for active service, feeling that their physical presence at the stated meetings of the church will suffice. Actually they are deceiving themselves, for by giving nothing to the church they make it difficult for the church to give much to them by way of enriched personality.

The church which is concerned about developing efficient churchmen must administer a program of religious education which will regard every pupil as potentially an active worker within its organization. We have never yet realized the power for its own salvation which the church holds in religious education. What, for example, would be the destiny of a church in which not ten per cent, but one hundred per cent, of the members are trained and actively at work in Christian service?

The church should give much thought to what will be expected of its boys and girls as they become able to assume the greater responsibilities for which maturity prepares them. It must in a sense make a job analysis of what churchmanship means. Then it must set out to train its members in such service as will make the church great. Training implies not simply intellectual preparation for tasks, but also the building of that dynamic idealism in the spirits of church members which will lead them forward in service and enable them to find satisfaction only when a worthy task in kingdom-building has been undertaken and achieved.

The church's program of religious education must go beyond this training for voluntary service and have a very specific concern for the vocational education to those who enter full-time Christian service—the ministers, the missionaries, the directors of religious education, and others. Upon the success with which these workers are trained depends the very future of the work of the church. Colleges and seminaries must be maintained for the training of men and women who shall be just as efficient in the religious calling as other professional workers are in their respective fields. Not the least of our concern must be with the development of the proper spirit and motive of those who are set aside to serve Christianity. Too often has the cause itself suffered because of the lack of humility and consecration in those who were ordained as its servants. No greater task is before religious education today than that of the training of the full-time workers in the kingdom.

While training in churchmanship must begin in and find its constant reference to the local church, it must not end there if it is to escape the confines of a narrow provincialism. Each local church is, after all, but a member in a large fellowship. Every churchman should feel his kinship in this great fellowship of believers the world over. If the church has a mission for the world, each individual who has joined himself with the purpose and work of the church should feel his fellowship with others in this common purpose. The church stands as the organized expression of Christianity in the world. Its primary duty, then, is the interpretation of the Christian religion to the world. But the church, as such, is an abstraction. It is, in other words, the duty of each individual churchman to interpret religion to the world. This is a worthy task and responsibility for which education for efficient church membership must prepare. Again we may say that we have never yet realized the power which is available at the very door of the church through religious education in making its members effective interpreters of the religion which it professes.

The curriculum of religious education must give the church the means whereby it will fulfill its function in the world. Education in churchmanship as we have indicated must come primarily by experience. Experience, however, needs to be interpreted and enlarged. Experience of the church in the particular community in which an individual lives, and as it exists in his generation, must be supplemented by an interpretation of the history of the church and its expanding influence. Many misunderstandings and imperfect conceptions of the meaning of the church would speedily be overcome if a thorough grounding were given in the history through which the Christian church has come. Moreover, the essential purpose of the church, both as historically manifested and as conceived today, should be the common property of church members as well as their common purpose. Inefficiency too often is due to a lack of understanding of what this organization is to which the individual member has joined himself, and what its purpose for the world may be. Moreover, our discussion on the necessity for an articulate statement of Christian faith would lead us to insist that education for membership should include training in the essential beliefs of the church and their meaning for modern life. There is no thought here that any individual should passively receive that which has once been delivered by the saints, but, on the other hand, we insist that each individual member should have the advantage of knowing what his church is and believes and does, so that he himself may intelligently build his relationship to it. Such education must go beyond a mere intellectual approach and provide that warm enthusiasm which gives the dynamic to act. This enthusiasm should result from a recognition of the great place which the church has fulfilled in the world, and from the experience of sharing with God in his work for the world as represented in organized Christianity. Thus work and worship should be intermingled in the experience of churchmanship.

Our emphasis on the need for direct personal service must not serve to blind us to the necessity for education in the financial support of the church. The experience of giving to the work of the church is one which touches the life of every pupil, both as a member in a family which is giving to the support of the church, and as a pupil in the church school who makes a direct offering to the work which the church represents. The best motivation for financial support is the identification of spirit and purpose with that of the church which must come from activities devoted to its service. Against this background in experience, religious education may teach the growing person certain fundamentals of

Christian giving which should guide him in his support of the church. Only through such comprehensive education in Christian giving will the church lift itself above the constant struggle for an adequate financial backing which so often overshadows its larger program of service.

2. *To guide growing persons into whole-hearted participation in constructive Christian service in and through the channels of the church.* In this objective we are thinking not so much of service to maintain the organism through which Christianity expresses itself, as of the outreach of the church in fulfilling its mission in the world. As of individuals, so of churches it may be said that they can be saved only by losing themselves in service. A church which asks only that it may receive, and which looks to its members only for support, should be rated as a parasitic institution. It is only the church which is constantly asking itself, "What may I do that others may be saved?" which may grow great through such service.

This question of the unique place of the church in the world may well occupy the attention of religious education. Few church members there are today who have a challenging conception of the purpose of their church beyond the maintenance of its own round of activities by and with and for its own members. Not too infrequently may there be heard the protest, when proposals are made to serve worthy causes, "We are giving too much to the outside!" A church which does not exist primarily for a great and worthy service can be classed little higher in the scale of social institutions than a club organized for the self-edification of its members, each paying his dues and getting what he pays for.

When one seeks to define the outgoing program of the church one finds it to be nothing short of the program of Christianity itself. Broadly stated, the church may say with its Master, "I came that they might have life and have it abundantly." Its aim must be to make Christian living common in the community which it serves. This of course involves many specific functions. Perhaps the very greatest and most effective of these is its work in Christian education. No missionary endeavor on the foreign field surpasses in importance the missionary work of the church at home as it gathers unto itself the young, not only of its own membership, but of the community, and educates them in Christian living. Not long ago the writer heard a protest from a prominent churchman because his church was giving free service in religious education to families who were not contributing to the church. He urged that each family should be charged for such service which the church renders. Shortsighted generation indeed! What greater privilege should the church seek than that of gathering under its influence the children of the world in order that they might be taught Christian living?

The promotion of community righteousness, the alleviation of suffering, the censorship of influences which are brought to bear on young life in the community—these and other endeavors are rightful functions of the church which seeks to spiritualize life. It is of course easy for the church to lose sight of its primary purpose and be strangled by its method. In its endeavor to bring Christian influences to bear upon the actions of governments, it may easily be led into an alliance with politics. In the effort to attain certain civic values it may be led into the temptation of compromising with secular institutions. These are but the hazards which must be faced in any endeavor which is to have the virility of a crusade.

The extension of the work and influence of the church beyond the borders of its own community and nation has been one of the most phenomenal aspects of its service. No one is inclined to doubt the great contribution which the missionary endeavor has made to modern civilization, yet at no point in church life have we been so utterly lacking in sound education. The average church member knows next to nothing about the purpose and meaning of the accomplishments of Christian missions. In our own day the emphases in Christian missions have been undergoing very fundamental changes. On every hand the question is being asked, "What of Christian missions?" The time has come when religious education must give a very prominent place to the missionary enterprise as one of the great outreaching endeavors of the church's life as it fulfills its work in the world.

Preparation for membership in the church must, therefore, include education in service. This will require education in the principles of Christian service, knowledge of service needs and the church's program to meet those needs, and a spirit of love which will spend itself to the uttermost in behalf of the needs of others. *First*, let us lay particular emphasis on education in the principles of service. Sound philanthropy and the Christian spirit of sharing are not in opposition to each other. Too many clever frauds have been practiced upon Christian people to permit us longer to allow men and women to become educated in religion without a thorough understanding of what is involved in the service aspect of Christian living. *Second*, let us be sure that our pupils have an intimate knowledge of the enterprises to which the church gives its attention in service. Only thus can we develop men and women who are competent to make intelligent decisions concerning the investment of their energies or of money. Intelligent discrimination with respect to causes is just as important as the impulse to give. *Third*, let us not be satisfied with knowledge alone, but let us make sure that there be added to knowledge a spirit of love which not simply gives, but *shares*. The heart of the giver must accompany the gift. Moreover, there must be that development of skill which will assure efficiency in service.

All of this may be summed up by insisting that practice under guidance is the avenue of training in service. The school of religion must provide abundant opportunity for growing persons to practice the art of service, if service is to form an important part of their lives.

3. *To develop in growing persons the ability and disposition to make a constructive contribution to the progressive realization of a church which expresses more and more perfectly the Christian concept of the will and purpose of God for the world.* The curriculum of religious education does not simply offer to the church an instrument for the fulfilling of its function in the world; it also pro-

vides the means whereby the church's life may be constantly lifted to higher levels.

It is hardly to be expected that an institution which finds its life in a changing society would ever be and remain in a state of final completion and perfection. The church in common with other institutions finds itself facing a changing world and unless it can keep in the vanguard of progress and help shape the direction of this change its influence on social life will wane. Many critics there have been who have predicted the end of the church as a living institution. In recent years criticism of the church has been more pronounced than ever before. Yet in spite of all dire predictions, the evidence now is pointing to a virility within the church which is able to recreate its own life in harmony with a changing world so that it may continue to lead the way to progress.

Changing conditions force upon the church new methods of working. This is not to say that its primary purpose has changed. It is simply to recognize that new occasions teach new duties. One of these changing conceptions of the purpose and work of the church is represented in the modern movement of religious education. Time was when the church supported education as a very necessary part of secular life, but conceived of its own work as being primarily of another nature. Gradually education was admitted to a part in the program of the church. Today there are those who see the whole work of the church as being one gigantic educational enterprise. This means that our interpretation of the meaning of education has changed, and that our whole outlook upon the work of the church and its relation to individual persons has undergone a transformation. If the desired results in the development of Christian personality can be attained through education, then there is no reason why the church should not adopt the educational method of approach.

It should be pointed out that education of churchmen to participate in the building of a changing church does not simply involve open-mindedness to new conditions, but also the critical faculty which is able to weigh the factors in a situation and keep uppermost the primary purpose which the church is to serve. We are not lacking in examples of churches being so eager to carry out the spirit of the times that means have been substituted for ends in view, and the primary purpose of the church has been lost in the details of its program.

Does the church, then, need to reconstruct its life toward a higher ideal? No one would maintain that in either its organization or its program the church is without fault. No one would assert that it is ready to meet the new day with perfect assurance of success. Let us look at but a few points where creative reconstructions of church life may well be centered:

(1) The church must place itself squarely in the forefront of human progress. It cannot be said always to have done so. Sometimes it has even sought to deter progress. It has sought to block the path of science. It has often supported rather than denied superstition. It has supported war, and other un-Christian institutions and social conditions. But its divine life has been proved over and over again in its ability to transcend its own faults.

(2) The church must make a clearer definition of the meaning of the essentials for which it stands. It has seemed so difficult to adhere to essentials and to keep free from nonessentials in church organization and doctrine. Yet the influence of the church in the world depends on its clear proclamation of the essential message through which it seeks to lead its people into the life more abundant.

(3) The church needs to achieve for itself a better business administration. It cannot be said that from every standpoint either the energy of men and women which has been placed at the disposal of churches, or their financial resources, have been used

wisely. Witness, for example, a group of women, eager to serve, spending the better part of a day in carrying out a program for the purpose of earning money for the church, and securing thereby a grand total of six dollars—an average earning of fifty cents per person! Witness the enormous amounts of money spent in erecting buildings, without adequate preliminary study of the purpose for which such buildings are intended! Instances could be multiplied to show the inefficiency which has resulted from lack of attention to proper business method in church administration. The least which should be expected is that an agency for Christian service should be managed with the efficiency of any private business enterprise.

(4) Perhaps the most serious problem which faces the church today is that of sectarian divisions. It is often difficult to see the church as a unifying and integrating force which will undergird society with high motives, in the face of the divisiveness which our present organization has brought into many communities. It is true, in a general sort of way, that on fundamental purposes the church stands as one. It would seem, however, that through nineteen centuries of Christian history men and women who are allied in a common cause might have developed a greater unity than is at present

manifested in our organizational divisions. It would seem that the Master's prayer "that they might be one" should before this time have been answered. If we will treat this problem as an educational matter, there is no doubt concerning the outcome in the next generation or two. Young people, coming at the problem with a freshness of viewpoint and hopefulness of attack, will want to know why all this sectarian division before giving themselves to its support. Will the adult generation have the courage to face the consequences of this type of education? There are not wanting voices which are crying that young people must first be thoroughly indoctrinated in denominational enterprises before they are permitted to share in the common purposes of Christianity with young people from other denominations. Shall we use education as a tool for preserving that which is, or shall it be a force for the development of personality, self-reliant, and capable of grappling with the question of things of greatest worth?

The purpose in the foregoing discussion has not been so much to deal exhaustively with the various problems which are facing the church today and which require an approach from the standpoint of reconstruction, as to point out by means of a few llustrations the need for this forward-looking element in Christian education. The church of today must not simply protect and foster its own life, but it must sow the seed which will blossom into the church of tomorrow, fit to meet the conditions of tomorrow.

CHAPTER XII

RACE HERITAGE

To effect in growing persons the assimilation of the best religious experience of the race, as effective guidance to present experience.

LET us remind the reader at the outset that this objective is mediate to the objectives discussed earlier. However, the emphasis which has been placed in the past upon religious culture, and particularly upon the learning of the Bible, has been so great that any discussion on objectives which omitted such specific reference would be incomplete. Further, in our present efforts to shift from education by transmission of culture to education by enrichment and control of experience we are in danger of going to the opposite extreme and leaving the riches of recorded past experience but inadequately touched. It is well, therefore, that we state clearly the purpose of present-day religious education at this point. There is a third reason why it is well to include this objective in any definition of the purpose of religious education. It is the primary responsibility of the religious school to acquaint growing persons with religious culture if they are to have the advantage of such acquaintance. The public school is effectively introducing the child to the culture of the race, save only that the religious culture is omitted from such experience. Unless the religious school can supply this lack, the child must go into maturity with less than is his just due from the experience of those who have gone before him.

Religious education involves the guidance of experience. A large place must be made in this process for the religious experience of the race as effective guidance to present experience. It will perhaps not be out of place to digress at this point and consider briefly the relation of experience to knowledge, and the place of subject-matter in education.

When a person is *experiencing*, he is in active relation with his environment. He is responding to situations. He is endeavoring to achieve a result, and in turn is undergoing the consequences of his acts. Only when the self is active can there be experience. It is not something which may be handed over to a person by others. When a person thus responds to his environment, the activity has a certain meaning for him. It leaves an effect on his mind and organism. The experience is conserved as knowledge, attitudes, or habits. The person has learned. He is never again the same. What he has learned becomes a part of the self and enters as a factor into every new experience.[1]

So much for the question of how knowledge emerges from experience. But an equally large problem now looms before us. To what extent may a person profit by the experience of others and avoid the tedious process of gaining knowledge by his own first-hand experience?

It need not be argued that the knowledge gained from experience by one person can be appropriated for use by another. A matter of such common observation is accepted by all. Through such means as conversation, the printed page, the radio, and pictures we appropriate daily the knowledge which thousands of others have gained through experience. Because of all the facilities for contact with the world of ideas and of things, the knowledge of a twelve-year-old child today may in many ways be broader than that of an average man a century ago.

But this is not to say that the knowledge of others may be transferred to us without conscious effort on our part. The value of knowledge lies in the fact that it helps us in the control of the situations which we are facing. It enhances our own experience. Thus we see again that it is the need of the learner which is the test of what knowledge will be of interest and use to him. In short, if the cumulative experience of the race which has been preserved as knowledge is to be of value to us, we must *reëxperience* it. We must relive it in our own experience.

---

[1] This paragraph and the four which follow are reprinted from the author's book, *Teaching for Christian Living*, by permission of the publishers, The Bethany Press, St. Louis.

With these considerations in mind, we must maintain that the heritage of the race resulting from religious experience must play a very important part in religious education.

The religious school exists because adults (teachers) possess the accumulated results of experience, both in the record preserved from the preceding generations of the race and in their own past experience, which in turn will help growing persons in determining which is the better and which is the less good life. It is a very one-sided interpretation of education which seeks to minimize the place of knowledge in guiding present experience. In fact, such a viewpoint could never have arisen except in protest to a former dominance of education by a transmissive viewpoint. It is only through the application of the wisdom of the ages to present problems that a superficial solution and a short-sighted adjustment can be avoided. The prophet and the seer, in whatever age their religious thinking was recorded, should be consulted for whatever light they may throw upon the problems of present-day Christian living. One aspect of the social significance of education is that it looks backward over the experience of the race and seeks to embody in the rising generation what has been found to be of greatest value.

Professor Athearn has emphasized the great importance to American life of acquainting children and young people with the religious culture of the race:

> We hope to arrive at a system of education which will offer to every American child the possibility of the religious heritage of the race. This should enable us to spiritualize our national ideals and to preserve our democratic institutions.
>
> Now, if the Church waits until American boys and girls have finished high school before they undertake to Christianize them the Church will fail, because the conduct of American people will be determined on the basis of the common knowledge, and ideals that are given to the children during these formative periods. Unless the Church supplies a Christian interpretation of these facts and ideals the citizens of the future will not determine their conduct according to Christian ideals.[2]

Professor Betts expresses much the same viewpoint when he says:

> The function of the curriculum is to make sure through its varied and rich content that our children shall thrill with the great concepts upon which the race has put its best effort and

---

[2] Athearn, Walter S., "American Religious Education Survey," in *Missionary Review*, March, 1920, p. 197.

> thought; that they shall be urged by the great ideals which have governed our predecessors at their best; that they shall be inspired by the great acts of those whose experiences constitute the highest spiritual culture of the ages.[3]

There are, of course, certain hazards which must be assumed in undertaking to acquaint growing persons with the culture of the past. These hazards center in the danger of substituting the thought of the past for their own creative activity in meeting present situations. This hazard is, however, much less than the one involved if we should fail to place at the disposal of the young that knowledge which has grown out of the experience of generations in meeting the situations of life under religious guidance.

In speaking of the responsibility of education toward the experience of the past, and of the obligation to allow each generation to make its own creative contribution, Professor Bower says:

> The adult generation may not do less than to see to it that the oncoming generation is initiated into the ideals, objectives, and methods of the Kingdom of God as these merge from the past, with sympathy and understanding. Beyond that point the present generation must trust the future generation to work out its problems in perfect freedom. . . . A clear perception of this continuity, an understanding and appreciation of

---

[3] From *The Curriculum of Religious Education*, pp. 263, 264, by George H. Betts. Copyright, 1924. Used by permission of The Abingdon Press.

objectives, and a sense of responsibility can be trusted as far as any sanction can be trusted to evoke what the learner judges, from his point of view, to be a Christian response.[4]

With the unfinished task each generation passes on to its successors the experience of the past and its own experience in dealing with it. In this way the tides of human life may ebb and flow, but there abides as a continuum through it all the unfinished task of human reconstruction and the progressive realization of the Kingdom of God. One of the major objectives of religious education should be the effective initiation of the immature into that continuing purpose and the priceless inheritance of experience that it carries with it.[5]

1. *To lead growing persons to a knowledge and an appreciation of the Bible.* Although the Sunday school in the past set out with the purpose of teaching the Bible, it was not highly successful in the realization of this major purpose. It is not an exaggeration to say that very few Christians may claim a thoroughgoing familiarity with the Bible as a result of their Sunday-school experience.

We may take our stand frankly on the proposition that one of the objectives of Christian religious education must be to teach the Bible. If we are to approach the educational task from the standpoint of life experience, we have an immediate contact with the experience of the child in the fact that the

---

[4] Bower, William C., *The Curriculum of Religious Education,* p. 219. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1925.

[5] Bower, William C., *The Curriculum of Religious Education,* p. 162. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1925.

Bible is a familiar factor in his home and church-school life. When we say that we desire that the pupil shall learn to know his Bible, we have in mind, of course, the ultimate objective that it may be used by him in actual life situations. Back of such use, however, lie certain aspects of knowledge and skill which might almost be classed as "tool" subjects:

(1) We should want the growing person to know something about the nature of the Bible. In the experience of all too many children it is little more than a book of magic. It may be just as necessary to teach what the Bible is *not* as to teach what the Bible is. Many persons need to learn that it is not a book of magic, not a book of science, not a book of fortune-telling. On the other hand, the positive values of the Bible should become increasingly evident as the pupil is enabled to appreciate and to understand its historical setting. While it is true that the Bible is so universal in its values that whoever comes to it earnestly seeking for light may receive in abundance, it is nevertheless true that in many of its aspects the Bible is a technical book. Some of the most exacting research has been spent on the problems involved in understanding its nature and message. Religious education must be fair both with the child and with the Book, and must present

its biblical teaching in the light of the best fruits of modern scholarship.

(2) Religious education should give to each growing person a general conception of the message of the Bible considered both as a whole and with respect to each of its separate books. Only in the light of such understanding can the Bible hold its most useful place in Christian living. Through such familiarity the child should learn to find himself at home in this great literature. He should have the necessary background to evaluate the several parts for his varying purposes. He should develop the power to withstand with knowledge and insight the aberrations in the interpretation of the Bible which have bowled over many well-meaning Christians.

(3) Religious education should give the growing person experience in the use of the Bible to meet the problems, moods, and religious hungers which arise as a natural consequence of living. Unless the Bible be found useful to this purpose in the lives of Christian people, there has been removed from us one of the chief reasons for its teaching. This will be an achievement growing naturally out of the "life-situation" approach in teaching.

(4) Religious education should seek also to realize the cultural values of teaching the Bible. In

most of our discussions on the teaching of the Bible it is assumed that the end in view is some form of overt conduct. To insist on conduct values too exclusively and narrowly is to be unduly utilitarian. Is there not also a cultural value which the Bible should serve? We teach English literature, art, music, and many other subjects, not because of their immediate relation to conduct, but because intrinsically they are of worth to human living. It may be urged with equally good reason that the Bible should form a part of the cultural curriculum of every person. Any literature in which there are recorded the great moving currents of life which we find in the Bible, any library which has the varieties in literary productions which we find in the several books of the Bible, must from the purely cultural standpoint rank high in our evaluation of curriculum materials.

(5) Religious education should lead to a deep appreciation and love for the Bible. This emotional aspect cannot be taught apart from the other aspects listed above, but it must be especially emphasized so that it may not be overlooked. We have had too many unfortunate by-products from our biblical teaching in the past to move incautiously here. There are grounds for believing that the *manner* of teach-

ing the Bible has often served to defeat the *purpose* for which it was taught.

(6) Religious education should make every growing person familiar with the physical make-up of the Bible and train him in the technic of handling it with facility. Often the Bible is a closed book because no key has been given to unlock it. Actual experience in its use, with appropriate drill at such points as require mechanization, is the only avenue to such ability in handling the Bible.

These ideals for religious education in the Bible must occupy attention over many years before they may be realized. Some starts may be made with little children. Some of the more difficult aspects must await the approach of maturity. The Bible should be, in short, a growing experience in the life of the Christian.

The teaching of the Bible involves many problems. Some of these are merely the outgrowth of an age of notoriously poor teaching, while others are problems which go to the very heart of things which divide Christian believers.

(1) One problem is that of selecting the messages in accordance with the life needs of those who are to be taught. It has frequently been pointed out that the teaching of much of the Old Testament, when given uncritically and without reference to its

historical setting, may lead to anti-Christian attitudes and ideals. This problem is to some extent solved in the new approach to religious education through the use of life experiences and needs. From this standpoint "the knowledge that is of most worth is that which furthers present experience by throwing light upon it and enabling the learner to direct it toward consciously selected ends." [6] Another criterion which may be applied in any use of the Bible as subject-matter is that of the degree to which it approximates the mind of Jesus and furthers the progressive realization of the ideals of the Kingdom of God. Such evaluation for life needs implies a degree of intelligence on the part of teachers and a care in selection on the part of curriculum committees which must exceed anything we have had in the past.

(2) A second problem in teaching the Bible is that arising out of the fact that while it is preëminently a book of religious experience, in the nature of the case this experience had to be expressed in the thought forms of the times. Often the reality of this experience has been lost because the form in which it was expressed was misunderstood. This difficulty is particularly acute in teaching little chil-

---

[6] Bower, William C., *The Curriculum of Religious Education,* p. 130. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1925.

dren, but the more mature are by no means immune from it. Too often have teachers of religion insisted that unless pupils could accept the science, the cosmology, and the chronology of the Bible, they could have no part in it whatsoever. Finding themselves unable to accept the first of these alternatives, many of these students have had to take the second. They have been lost to the religious life because of misunderstanding teachers.

(3) A third teaching difficulty grows out of the prevailing difference in our conceptions of the meaning of the authority of the Bible. It has always been assumed in Christian teaching that the Bible occupies a place of unique authority. To countless numbers a reminder that "the Bible says so" has been sufficient to assure acceptance of the viewpoint for which such support was desired. Many in our day would accord this supreme authority to every part of the Bible. Others would insist that we should no longer depend upon such external authority, but rather should let the Bible furnish its own basis of authority. Their position would be that we do not accept the moral standards of the Bible because they are in the Bible, but we accept the Bible because we appreciate its value through its teaching of such high moral standards. It is not our purpose here to defend one or the other of these viewpoints, or

for that matter any one of many other viewpoints which might be stated. Our point simply is that teaching difficulties are created by these conflicting opinions.

To some extent our answer to the above difficulties lies in the educational method itself. When we undertake to teach there are certain obligations laid upon us which we may not shirk. One of these is that we shall not evoke external authorities for the support of our particular viewpoint. Proved facts may be stated with authority because they are facts. Opinions, on the other hand, must be distinguished from facts, and the learner must be given an opportunity to build his own convictions in the light of the best thought which we can put at his disposal. Concerning the teaching of the Bible Kilpatrick writes:

> First of all we should deal fairly with our children as to the authority of the Bible. Some seem to think they may with impunity teach outworn theories to the young in the hope that they will safely outgrow them. To do so is to risk the confidence of our children in us and in our essential rectitude. We cannot afford such risk. The inherent psychology of the Bible is extraordinarily true, but much of its history and most of its science is not true. We must be truthful to our children.[7]

We have referred above to the problem created by various views concerning the Bible and its teachings. Usually these views are labeled as "conservative" or "liberal," though these terms are not always acceptable by those of either extreme. Suppose we should sincerely attempt to follow the position that we must not indoctrinate our children with our own viewpoints simply because we happen to believe them, unless they are based on proved facts. Would it not then fall to our lot to expose growing persons to the best in all viewpoints and let them come to their own conclusions concerning which they shall embrace? Perhaps it is expecting too much to suggest that religious educators should accept and practice this educational ideal. In any event, the particular viewpoint held by the one who teaches has a tremendous advantage over all other viewpoints even though he tries to be absolutely fair in its presentation. There is a suggestion here, however, for developing a broad-minded tolerance which may go a long way toward removing some of the disintegrating influences which have resulted from our dividedness on religious matters.

---

[7] Kilpatrick, William H., "Thinking in Childhood and Youth," in *Religious Education*, February, 1928, p. 140.

2. *To lead growing persons to a familiarity with the best Christian thought as a stimulus and guide toward a developing faith.* We are concerned here with the best products of religious thinking through the ages, and particularly since New Testament times. To express it in technical terms, we would

maintain that religious education should induct every person into an understanding appreciation of Christian theology, the philosophy of religion, and other related subjects. Only to name these subjects would of course indicate that in the average religious school they must be faced in very elementary form. Nevertheless, if Christian faith is to prosper, it would seem that the growing Christian should feel at home in the best Christian thought just as he learns to become familiar with secular thought through his public-school experience.

> If religion is to be a dominant reality and a controlling factor in life it must rest on a foundation of definite and comprehensive knowledge of the truths and principles of the Christian religion. If we would have the truths and principles of Christianity control in our democracy, we must make them through education a part of the mental and spiritual possessions of our youth in their education.[8]

In recent times there has been hesitation in giving consideration to the more formal expressions of Christian thought in doctrines and creeds. This is perhaps a natural reaction from some of the more unwholesome results which have resulted from too arbitrary teaching of creeds. Nevertheless, Weigle maintains that

---

[8] Betts, George H., "The Curriculum of Religious Education," in *Religious Education*, February, 1920, p. 5.

> The church's creed constitutes the platform or body of convictions that underlies the whole of its work in religious education. We stand in need of more clear and thorough, rather than less, teaching of the great fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. This teaching should not be dogmatic and arbitrary, but reasonable; . . ." [9]

Every great movement is indebted to its spiritual leader for progress. Christianity is no exception to this rule. Just as we honor those who have helped to make our national life great, so Christian religious education should seek to give the pupil an appreciative familiarity with the lives and teachings of the Christian leaders who have helped to make the church great. Reverent appreciation should displace the dark ignorance which today so often exists with respect to the leaders of Christian thought.

On the other hand, true education cannot be satisfied with merely transmitting to growing persons the thinking of others. Any understanding appreciation must involve a certain amount of creative participation in making that religious thought one's very own. Moreover, if our religion is to be a vital and growing reality which can adjust itself continually to the needs of changing times, then our teaching of the religious heritage must be given in such a way that each growing person is given the ability and disposition to make a creative contribution to the religious thought of the present and future.

---

[9] From *The Training of Children in the Christian Family,* by Luther A. Weigle, p. 221. Copyright, 1922. Used by permission of *The Pilgrim Press.*

3. *To lead growing persons into a sympathetic appreciation of the best thought and ideals in other faiths.* The time has passed when Christian belief and the belief represented in other religions can be separated by a line with all the good on one side and all that is worthless on the other. A deeper appreciation of the meaning of our own religion is leading men to respect more fully the striving of other peoples as they reach out after reality. If God be one God, and the religious impulse be universally implanted in the human heart, then we should feel akin to all those who have faithfully sought and found some manifestation of this divine life in the soul of man.

We are today striving for the realization of a large-group consciousness to take the place of our narrow provincialism. We are seeking for ways in which this may effectively be taught through bonds which will unite our experience with that of others. Is not this common religious aspiration such as to make the whole world kin? Instead of allowing our differences to set us apart, may not an appreciative study of the religious beliefs and usages of others serve to unite?

It is those who have been at the forefront of the expansion of Christianity in its missionary work who have been in a position to give us the most sympathetic appreciation of the religious cultures of other peoples, while at the same time being most clear in discerning their shortcomings. The new approach to missionary education, seeking first of all an appreciation of those to whom we seek to minister, cannot help but introduce us more fully to the religions which differ from our own, even as it is seeking to introduce these peoples to the Christian religion. Thus we shall find that by giving to others we shall also receive from them.

It may be questioned whether such attention to other religions may not confuse the minds of growing persons, or even lead them to appreciate less the Christian religion. In answer to this very natural question, certain statements should be made regarding educational procedure.

(1) If religion is conceived as life, then for the most part religious education will concern itself with guidance in life situations, offering to growing persons the best that our race experience has made available. A minimum of consideration will be given to systematic systems of thought.

(2) Gradually there will emerge the history and beliefs of the Christian religion. While experience

must be primary, the results of experience must gradually be formulated and systematized if the highest value is to accrue from present experience in future situations. Thus the pupil should, by the time he has passed through early adolescence, have a fairly logical picture of what Christianity is, what it believes, and what difference it has made and is making in the life of the world.

(3) The study of other religions should follow a thorough grounding in the meaning of Christianity. This will constitute a type study, a norm, whereby the others may be understood and evaluated. We once heard a prominent educator seriously recommend that the study of all religions, including Christianity, should be delayed until adolescence, and that then the youth should have all presented to him with equal intellectual fairness and without emotional warmth, so that he might choose his own. The fallacy in this position is that if religion is *life*, it cannot be donned as are long trousers at a certain time of life. Life opens the way for a religious interpretation throughout the earlier years, and we would be unfaithful to our educational charge if we failed to meet this natural need. And having set out to meet it, we, as religious educators, have no apology to offer for meeting it in the best way we know. There are certain obligations which

rest upon maturity which must be discharged, and one of these is that of teaching our children the best religious life and thought which we know.

(4) When the study of comparative religion does come into the curriculum, it should be introduced in perfect fairness to all. There has been too much comparison of the best in one with the worst in others. Let the growing person see the best that all have to offer. If he finds Christianity to be superior to other religions (as we think he will), then such study cannot but increase the pupil's love for and devotion to Christianity. If, as is more than likely, he will find many things in other religions which he can admire and which make them akin to his own, then his horizon has to that extent been broadened, and a new link in the chain of world brotherhood has been forged.

4. *To lead growing persons to an acquaintance with and appreciation of religious culture as recorded in the fine arts.* Our interpretation of the subject-matter of religious education has been too narrowly confined to religious literature. Much of our fine art has grown out of the religious impulse. Both from the standpoint of conduct values, and from the standpoint of culture, the fine arts should have an important place in the curriculum of religious education.

As we contemplate the educational value of the arts, there comes to mind at once the rich abundance of paintings, based on Bible themes, or otherwise carrying out the religious motive. The chief use which has been made of these masterpieces of art in schools of religion has been as attention-getters for stories or talks. How rarely, for example, have the stained-glass windows been illuminated through an interpretation of their meaning, which might ever after make the house of worship have a deeper significance! A much more thoroughgoing use of the great masterpieces of art should be made so that the learner's life may be blessed by these enriching contacts.

Music comes to mind as another of the arts which should furnish subject-matter for religious education. Happily, we have not been totally lacking in our appreciation of the place of music in worship, but too often the quality of the music used has been very inferior. The interpretation of music as an expression of religious aspirations and emotions has received scant attention in our curricula.

Religious poetry, as a part of the religious heritage of the race, has been neglected by the church school in common with poetry generally in American education. Our better hymn books are a rich mine of subject-matter of which only a few veins have been touched. In confining our attention too closely to the ancient literature, immortalized through inclusion in the canon, we have allowed some of the finest expressions of religious experience as contained in our more modern literature to go by untouched. Religious drama should be mentioned in this category as rich in value for religious education.

Architecture is another of the arts which should have a part in our curriculum. How strange that we should spend our millions for the erection of great churches and cathedrals for the glory of God, but fail to instruct our young in the meaning of what we have done, so that the religious aspirations represented might be created anew in their hearts with their every presence in such buildings.

There is no field of human interest which is richer in subject-matter as represented in the fine arts than religion. A distinct obligation rests on religious education to bring each new generation into the fullness of its heritage.

PART THREE

The Next Steps—Specific Objectives

CHAPTER XIII

DEFINING OBJECTIVES IN SPECIFIC TERMS

IN PART I we developed a theory of objectives as a basis for our work. In Part II we reported a study which was made with a view to stating a series of comprehensive objectives, and gave a major part of the space to a discussion of the objectives which this study yielded. The next logical step is that of defining specific objectives on the basis of which educational procedure may be initiated and results tested. In Part III we shall make a brief survey of the task which lies ahead in taking this next step.

Throughout this study, it has been assumed that defining comprehensive objectives was but a first step in a process. The results of this step will be of little value unless utilized further in defining specific objectives, and unless regarded as themselves subject to progressive revision as a result of such further study. The scope of this book will not permit us to go beyond a brief discussion of the relation of comprehensive objectives to specific objectives, of the nature and function of specific objectives, and of a few of the current methods of study through which it is sought to define objectives in specific terms.

Specific objectives may be thought of as desired outcomes in the experience of growing persons which are necessary steps in realizing comprehensive objectives. They must sustain a very close relation to on-going experience. In their lowest terms they are desired outcomes in individual situations. They represent the meaning in Christian living of individual situations when seen in the light of the more comprehensive or general objectives. Their value lies in making the desired outcomes of the educational process more concrete, the procedure for achieving this outcome more definite, and the test of educational effectiveness more immediate.

There are several ways in which we may approach this task of defining specific objectives:

(1) We may start with the comprehensive objectives themselves and develop our specific expressions of them by analysis. This, however, will lead us into all the errors of "swivel-chair" pronouncements. It will lead to statements of objectives which are too far removed from life. It will defeat the very end which specific objectives are supposed to serve.

(2) We may begin with life itself, and by observation, analysis, and experimentation derive a faithful picture of those who are to be educated and

the conditions under which they live. When this has been done, we may select out from our findings the significant elements for religious education. The weakness of this procedure is that it throws away the very guidance which comprehensive objectives are supposed to offer. There is no way of determining what are the "significant elements" of experience for religious education except by the guidance of the general aims of religious education—that is, the comprehensive objectives.

(3) A third method of procedure is to use the two approaches in combination. Study of actual life experience there must be if religious education is to have value for Christian living. Guidance in this study there must be if it is to eventuate in fruitful outcomes. Research can be carried on with a hope of achievement only when a definite problem for investigation has been defined. Thus, the Character Education Inquiry started with the problem of honesty. The worth of honest conduct was assumed. No amount of pure research could prove the worth of that ideal. From the findings of that study, however, it will be possible to set new objectives and new procedures for education in honesty. This illustrates the interrelation of the ultimate ideal and the work of research.

We shall conclude this discussion with a description of a few of the approaches which are being made to the study of experience in the process of defining specific objectives. Education looks not to the past, nor to the present only, but to the future. It invokes the aid of the past to give guidance and enrichment in meeting the situations of the present, with the end in view that growing persons may live more abundantly. The ultimate goal which Christian thought has set up for the good society is that designated by the term Kingdom of God. The educator's problem in setting the goals for his task is to mark out the points at which advancement toward this ideal may be made. One of his first tasks is the uncovering of the actual experience of growing persons so that growth toward the ideal of Christian living may be fostered.

There are various ways in which the study of the experience of growing persons may be made. Each of these methods no doubt has its own contribution to make to our total understanding of experience:

(1) One approach is that of the analysis of human relations and functions. This has much in common with the technic of job-analysis. A beginning in this sort of study is that described in Chapter IV under the title, "The Areas of Human Experience."

In brief, this is a method through which it is sought to define the relations which a person sustains to impersonal nature, to his home and its members, to those whom he meets in his community, and so forth. Out of these relations grow certain functions which require activities of various types. A complete analysis of this kind should give a complete picture of the person's activities. Setting over against this analysis the comprehensive objectives of religious education, it is possible to define the points at which religious education should enter the process as interpretation, guidance, and control.

(2) Another approach to defining the specific objectives of religious education is that of a study of the situations to which growing persons are responding, with particular emphasis on problem-situations. Growth takes place through experience, and the point at which experience is most active is where the growing person is responding to his situations. Education may seek to accomplish its purpose through the conditioning of the responses to such situations.

But the matter of securing a report on life situations is by no means simple. One method which has been proposed[1] is that of objective observation. The observer must record all the facts just as he sees and hears them. In this manner, it is maintained, an accurate record will be obtained of all the factors to which the person responds and what he does in response to these factors. What the advocates of this method seem to overlook, however, is that the *objective* factors do not completely describe the situation, and further, that no report which must be made through a human agency can be entirely free from subjective interpretations.

---

[1] Bower, W. C., *The Curriculum of Religious Education*, chap. xii; also Research Service Bulletin No. 6 of the International Council of Religious Education, entitled *Life Experiences and the New Curriculum.*

Another type of situation report which is advocated is that which a person makes of his own situations. This has the advantage of taking into account the subjective factors, and of reporting the objective facts as they *appeared* to the one reacting to them. The problematic elements in this type of report are the accuracy of recall and the faithfulness of report on the facts as they actually appeared. Much needs still to be done in establishing the validity of such subjective reports by checking them with the observation of parents, teachers, and others who come in contact with the respondents. Norman E. Richardson has made extensive use of this method, and claims for his procedure the practical elimination of the disqualifying factors here mentioned. The Bureau of Research of the International Council of Religious Education has also carried out some experimentation with this method.

The method of objective observation has the advantage of being applicable to all ages, while the method of self-report on situations has the advantage of reaching the details of the situation more intimately. For older groups it should be most effective to use the two methods in conjunction. After full account is taken of the inherent weaknesses, the defining of immediate objectives on the basis of actual life situations does yet have much in its favor. It should be assumed, of course, that this method will be applied in conjunction with other approaches.

(3) The study of interests of growing persons is a method for the study of experience which deserves further development. If we grant that growth takes place best through whole-hearted, purposeful activities, we may assume that the interests of the learner will serve to indicate the point at which such activities can best be initiated. Interests will further reveal the points at which the person is most active, and therefore the point at which guidance and enrichment of his experience can best take place. ✓

The problem of research methods for revealing interests is one which needs still to be worked out. Perhaps the approach through parents, in the case of children, will be the most fruitful. Through individual case studies of the interests of a limited group it should be possible to build a check-list which can readily be used with large numbers of boys and girls and their parents and teachers. In the case of younger children, the approach must be wholly through parents and teachers. Such checking should make possible a further development and completion of the lists of interests, and the establishment of norms of interest on the basis of a sufficiently large number of cases. Through such procedure it should be possible to build up an instrument for the study of interests in any group. Children's reading, games, and other leisure-time activities will be a significant guide to interests.

(4) A study of behavior difficulties is a promising method for revealing the points at which education may be most effectively applied in the experience of growing persons. Perhaps the most fruitful source of data on this problem will be found in the records of courts of juvenile delinquency, departments of juvenile research, records of visiting teachers, and others who deal with conduct breakdowns in growing boys and girls.

It is recognized, of course, that this method places chief reliance on the study of abnormal cases. However, the study of the abnormal, in both psychology and medicine, has yielded some of the richest data for the interpretation of the normal. This would not be a justifiable procedure as a single approach to our problem, but as one of many approaches it holds promise of fruitful returns. It is through such statistical studies of the points of breakdown in conduct that goals of religious education may be set up. The problem is not simply one of cure in the case of those who have suffered such difficulties, but also one of prophylactic treatment to prevent similar breakdown in others.

Religious education should, in its use of breakdown situations, go beyond the treatment of those classed as moral delinquency. Breakdown may occur at the point of any of the ultimate objectives set up. It may be a breakdown in faith, a failure to develop an effective Christian philosophy of life, and so forth. In all cases, the ultimate objectives serve to give guidance and meaning to such research into specific problems, and serve as the criteria by which to define and isolate the specific educational values.

(5) A method of defining the objectives of religious education through the analysis of desired character outcomes was described in Chapter IV. The procedure followed in this study was to determine, through analysis of the ideals in the literature of the Bible, and the ideals of Christian living held by certain Christian men and women, the traits of character which most completely define Christian personality. This is, in effect, an analysis of one of the

ultimate objectives in order to break it up into more workable units. The procedure goes further, however, and relates each of these ideals or traits to concrete situations in which it comes to expression and through which it is to be realized. Thus this method of approach provides a technic whereby the ultimate objective of Christian character may be reduced to specific terms. This is an illustration of the way in which comprehensive objectives serve to set in motion the activity for the determination of the desired outcomes in very specific terms.

The approach to objectives through an analysis of character, when taken in proper relation to other methods, has promising possibilities. The Character Education Inquiry has demonstrated how single traits representing desirable conduct goals may be investigated to determine their actual expression in the lives of growing persons, how the factors conditioning such expression may be isolated, and thus has made the data available on the basis of which the more specific educational objectives may be set up, and the procedures for realizing these objectives set in motion.

(6) In the foregoing methods, we have been concerned chiefly with the determination of certain conduct goals. We have tried to consider these goals

in terms of the whole individual expressing himself through the situations which he faces.

In order to make these conduct goals effective, however, there are certain mediate psychological goals which must be attained. How, for instance, shall we approach the Christian solution for the problem of war? Certainly our approach must include the giving of basic information, the development of right attitudes, and the building up of certain reaction patterns as habitual modes of response. In a similar way, every objective needs for its realization a supporting galaxy of psychological attainments. The determination of these psychological goals is one of the most important steps to be undertaken in the development of the objectives of religious education. While it is desirable to look at our objectives from the viewpoint of the whole pupil as active in meeting situations, in our educational procedure we must go beyond the mere situation to the factors controlling the response.

These technics will serve as a few illustrations of the attempts which are being made in studying the life experience of growing persons. Others might be added. New technics will probably be devised as we come to closer grips with the problem. There is strength in approaching the problem from many angles. Religious education is so intimately related to human life, and that life is so complex, that it is futile to attempt to determine the objectives of religious education on the basis of any single method. Scientific research in the field of moral character and religious personality is still in its infancy. We are not yet able to accord to any of the methods used in curriculum research the distinction of calling them scientifically accurate. But significant beginnings have been made. If various approaches can be used simultaneously, and each permitted to make its own peculiar contribution, we shall have gone a long way on the road toward a more comprehensive purpose and a more effective practice in religious education.

The greatest need of religious education today is the advancement of curriculum research. Work in this field has hardly begun. The rearing of the structure of a better religious teaching must await the laying of sound foundations through scientific work. It is a task which should enlist the resources of many agencies and individuals. Coöperative effort should be employed to eliminate duplication and to assure advancement toward a common purpose. Here lies the field for the next steps in defining specific objectives for religious education!

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I. SOURCES ON WHICH THE STUDY IN OBJECTIVES WAS BASED

IN THE following bibliography the most significant literature which was consulted in making this study in objectives has been listed. In the case of the ten religious educators the original manuscript contains a complete list of the writings of each. In the interest of economy, the titles of such books and magazine articles as do not have a bearing on objectives, and those which constitute reprints or syndicate editions of titles already in the list, have here been eliminated. In the case of the four general educators only the writings which were designated by them as dealing with religious education are listed.

JOSEPH MANSON ARTMAN

A. BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

1. *Undergraduates*
   By R. H. Edwards, J. M. Artman, and Galen M. Fisher.
   New York, Doubleday, Doran & Company, 1928.
2. *Religion the Dynamic of Education*, edited by Walter M. Howlett, chapter on "Leadership Attitudes as Principles of Education."
   New York, Harper & Brothers, 1929.

B. ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

(a) ‘‘Expressional Activities in the Light of Current Psychology,” in
Religious Education, 13:9–14 (February, 1918).

(b) ‘‘Function of the Association in Relation to Religious Education in the Community,” in
Religious Education, 14:322–328 (October, 1919).

(c) ‘‘World Fellowship and Other Peoples,” in
Religious Education, 16:195–198 (August, 1921).

(d) ‘‘Week-Day Curriculum Material: How to Determine the Value of a Curriculum,” in
The Church School, 3:549 (September, 1922).

(e) ‘‘Evaluation of Curricula for Week-Day Religious Education,” in
Religious Education, 17:151–161 (April, 1922).

(f) ‘‘What Can Religious Education Do with Human Nature?” in
Religious Education, 18:78–83 (April, 1923).

(g) ‘‘The Place of Religious Education in Building a Christian Citizenship,” in
The International Journal of Religious Education, 2:30 (June, 1926).

(h) ‘‘Factors Underlying the Curriculum,” in
Religious Education, 21:584–588 (December, 1926).

(i) ‘‘Primary Grouping as Problem and Asset to Religious Education,”
(By J. M. Artman and Ruth Shonle), in
Religious Education, 22:153–160 (February, 1927).

(j) ‘‘A Survey of Recent Tendencies in Adult Education in the United States and Their Significance for Religious Education,”
(By J. M. Artman and J. A. Jacobs), in
Religious Education, 22:962–971 (November, 1927).

(k) "Rethinking Organization for Religious Education,"
(By J. M. Artman and J. A. Jacobs), in
Religious Education, 23: 979–991 (December, 1928).
(l) "The Significance of Present Trends in the Character Education Movement,"
(By J. M. Artman and J. A. Jacobs), in
Religious Education, 23:240–253 (March, 1928).
(m) "Foreseeing a Religious Educational Program for a Local Church,"
(By J. M. Artman and J. A. Jacobs), in
Religious Education (October, 1929).

WALTER SCOTT ATHEARN

A. BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

1. *The Church School*
Boston, The Pilgrim Press, 1914.
2. *The City Institute for Religious Teachers*
Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1915.
3. *A Community System of Religious Education*
Boston, The Pilgrim Press, 1917.
4. *The Organization and Administration of the Church School*
Boston, The Pilgrim Press, 1917.
5. *Religious Education and American Democracy*
Boston, The Pilgrim Press, 1917.
6. *Making Democracy Safe for the World*
Chicago, International Sunday School Association, 1918.
7. *The Malden Survey*
New York, Interchurch World Movement of North America, 1920.
8. *A National System of Education*
New York, George H. Doran Company, 1920.
9. *An Introduction to the Study of the Mind* (Section III of *Teaching the Teacher*)
Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1921.

10. *Character Building in a Democracy*
    New York, The Macmillan Company, 1924.
11. *Crime Prevention*
    Elgin, Illinois, The Tabloid Press, 1926.

B. ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

(a) ‘‘Teachers for Weekday Religious Schools,” in
Religious Education, 11:245–252 (June, 1916).

(b) ‘‘American Religious Education Survey,” in
Missionary Review, 43:197–199 (March, 1920).

(c) ‘‘The Interchurch Religious Education Survey,” in
Religious Education, 15:172–175 (June, 1920).

(d) ‘‘Protestantism and Democracy,” in
National Education Association, 51:7–21 (1922).

(e) “What Is Research in Religious Education?’’ in
Religious Education, 16:349 (December, 1921).

(f) ‘‘The Organization of Protestant Christian Education in the United States,” in
Religious Education, 17:60–63 (1922).

(g) ‘‘The Malden Plan,” in
Religious Education, 17:208–212 (1922).

(h) ‘‘The Devil’s Month in America,” in
Church School, 4:488 (August, 1923).

(i) ‘‘The Indiana Survey,” in
Religious Education, 21:113–121 (1926).

(j) ‘‘Protestantism’s Contribution to Character Building in a Democracy,” in
International Journal of Religious Education, 2:26 (June, 1926).

(k) ‘‘Correlation of the Educational Programs of the Church and State,” in
Religious Education, 22:758–764 (September, 1927).

(l) ‘‘Are Teachers Prepared to Give Moral Training?” in
Religious Education, 24: 822–825 (November, 1929).

GEORGE HERBERT BETTS

A. BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

1. *How to Teach Religion*
   New York, The Abingdon Press, 1919.
2. *The Curriculum of Religious Education*
   Chicago, Northwestern University, 1920.
3. *The New Program of Religious Education*
   New York, The Abingdon Press, 1921.
4. *The Curriculum of Religious Education*
   New York, The Abingdon Press, 1924.
5. *Method in Teaching Religion*
   New York, The Abingdon Press, 1925.
6. *The Week-Day Church School*
   New York, The Abingdon Press.
7. *The Beliefs of 700 Ministers*
   New York, The Abingdon Press, 1929.

B. ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

(a) "The Renaissance of Religious Education," in
The Church School, 1:31 (January, 1920).

(b) "The Curriculum of Religious Education," in
Religious Education, 15:5–20 (February, 1920).

(c) "What Does Religious Education Mean to the Church?"
Religious Education, 15:161 (June, 1920).

(d) "Standards in Week-Day Religious Education," in
The Church School, 2:497 (August, 1921).

(e) "Correlation Between Sunday and Week-Day Schools," in
The Church School, 3:184 (January, 1922).

(f) "The Aims of Week-Day Religious Education," in
Religious Education, 17:11–15 (February, 1922).

(g) "What Makes Education Religious?" in
Religious Education, 18:84–88 (April, 1923).

(h) "The Meaning of Correlation—Relating Material and Methods to Experience," in
The Church School, 5:11 (October, 1923).

(i) "If the Sunday School Fails," in
Christian Century, 42:154–155 (January 29, 1925).

(j) "Is Week-Day Religious Instruction Here to Stay?" in
International Journal of Religious Education, 1:21 (March, 1925).

(k) "Principles of Curriculum Making," in
Religious Education, 21:574–581 (December, 1926).

(l) "Of the Making of Many Books," in
International Journal of Religious Education, 4:17–18 (January, 1928).

(m) "How the Child Learns to Know and Love God," in
International Journal of Religious Education, 4:9–10 (March, 1928).

(n) "Will the Public School Movement for Character Education Supersede the Church School?" in
Religious Education, 23:462–465 (May, 1928).

(o) "Perennial Tasks of Religious Education," in
Religious Education, 23:699–703 (September, 1928).

(p) "Character Education as an Objective in the Public School," in
International Journal of Religious Education, 5:11 (November, 1928).

(q) "Making a Road Map," in
International Journal of Religious Education, 5:11–12 (January, 1929).

(r) "Direct or Indirect Character Education," in
Journal of the National Education Association (May, 1929

(s) "What Do We Do When We Worship?" in
Christian Century (May 8, 1929).

WILLIAM CLAYTON BOWER

A. BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

1. *A Survey of Religious Education in the Local Church*
Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1919.
2. *The Educational Task of the Local Church*
St. Louis, published for the Teachers Training Publishing Association, by the Front Rank Press, 1921.
3. *The Curriculum of Religious Education*
New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.
4. *Religious Education in the Modern Church*
St. Louis, Bethany Press, 1929.

B. ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

(a) "A Suggestive Approach to the Reconstruction of the Curriculum of the School of Religion," in
Religious Education, 12:231–238 (June, 1917).
(b) "The Proposed Program of the International Curriculum of Religious Education," in
The Church School, 5:82 (November, 1923).
(c) "How Might Churches Plan for the Next Twenty Years?" in
Religious Education, 18:161–164 (June, 1923).
(d) "Present Tendencies in Curriculum Making," in
International Journal of Religious Education, 1:21 (September, 1925).
(e) "Are There Five Formal Steps in Teaching?" in
International Journal of Religious Education, 2:48 (April, 1926).
(f) "Protestantism's Contribution to Character Building in a Democracy"—A Review of Dean Athearn's Address—in
International Journal of Religious Education, 2:29 (June, 1926).

(g) ''The Project Principle from the Standpoint of the Curriculum,'' in
Religious Education, 21:466–471 (October, 1926).
(h) ''The Church as Educator,'' in
Religious Education, 22:368–416 (April, 1927).
(i) ''The Task Ahead, as I See It,'' in
Religious Education, 22:453–454 (May, 1927).
(j) ''Basic Principles in Curriculum Construction,'' in
International Journal of Religious Education, 3:20 (June, 1927).
(k) ''What State and Church Are Doing for Character Education,'' in
Religious Education, 22:579–581 (June, 1927).
(l) ''Conflict of Educational Ideals,'' in
Religious Education, 22:598–599 (June, 1927).
(m) "The Problem of Cooperation Between Church and State," in
Religious Education, 22:624–626 (June, 1927).
(n) ''What Can We Do?'' in
Religious Education, 22:626–630 (June, 1927).
(o) ''Curriculum of Religious Education,'' in
Religious Education, 22:646–649 (June, 1927).
(p) ''Curriculum Demands on Leadership,'' in
International Journal of Religious Education, 3:8 (September, 1927).
(q) ''The Curriculum as Enriched and Controlled Experience,'' in
The Journal of Religion, 7: No. 5–6 (October, 1927).
(r) ''The Place of the Personal Relation to God in the Curriculum,'' in
International Journal of Religious Education, 4:18 (March, 1928).
(s) "The Significance for Religious Education of Trends in the Psychology of Religion," in
Religious Education, 23:7–19 (January, 1928).

(t) "Religious Experience Through Crises in Individual Growth and Social Experience," in
Study VII, *Experience in Personal Religion.* The Institute of Sacred Literature of the University of Chicago (April, 1928).
(u) "The Nature and Use of Research," in
Religious Education, 24:300–307 (April, 1929).
(v) "Character Education Through Creative Pupil Experience," in
Bulletin of the Department of Elementary School Principals (June, 1929).

GEORGE ALBERT COE

A. BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

1. *The Spiritual Life—Studies in the Science of Religion*
New York, Eaton & Mains, 1900.
2. *The Religion of a Mature Mind*
Chicago, Fleming H. Revell, 1902.
3. *Can Religion Be Taught?*
(Inaugural address published by the Union Theological Seminary, New York, November 16, 1909.)
4. *Virtue and the Virtues—A Study of Method in Teaching of Morals*
(In Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association of the United States, 1911, pp. 419–425.)
5. *Education in Religion and Morals*
Chicago, Fleming H. Revell, 1904.
6. *The Psychology of Religion*
Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1916.
7. *A Social Theory of Religious Education*
New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917.
8. *Law and Freedom in the School*
Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1924.

9. *What Ails Our Youth?*
   New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.
10. *Is Religion Uniting or Separating Us?*
   (Printed in *Concerning Parents:* A symposium on Present-Day Parenthood, pp. 257–264, New York, 1926.)
11. *The Motives of Men*
   New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.
12. *What Is Christian Education?*
   New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.

B. ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

(a) "Religious Education and General Education," in
Religious Education, 12:123–128 (April, 1917).

(b) "Church-School Teaching and the War," in
Religious Education, 13:130–131 (April, 1918).

(c) "The Functions of Children in the Community," in
Religious Education, 13:26–32 (February, 1918).

(d) "What Are the Motives Under Which Men Co-operate Today?" in
Religious Education, 13:171–179 (June, 1918).

(e) "Do You Really Believe in Religious Education?" in
Religious Education, 14:5–11 (February, 1919).

(f) "A Scheme for Helpful Observation Work in Sunday Schools," in
Religious Education, 14:95–103 (April, 1919).

(g) "Nature of Discipline for Democracy," in
Religious Education, 14:136–147 (June, 1919).

(h) "The Next Step in Religious Education," in
Christian Century, 36:9–12 (December 25, 1919).

(i) "The Pupil's Motives in Learning," in
Sunday School Journal, pp. 591ff. (1920).

(j) "Week-Day Curriculum Material: I. Types of Material," in
The Church School, 3:547 (September, 1922).

(k) "Opposing Theories of the Curriculum," in
Religious Education, 17:143–150 (April, 1922).

(l) "Religious Education and Political Conscience," in
Religious Education, 17:430–435 (December, 1922).
(m) "What Is 'Religious' Education?" in
Religious Education, 18:92–95 (April, 1923).
(n) "Religious Education as a Problem of Christian Missions," in
International Review of Missions, pp. 72–81 (1923).
(o) "Shall We Manufacture Our Curriculum, or Grow It?" in
Sunday School Journal, pp. 458–460 (1923).
(p) "Who Is Enriched by the Enrichment of Worship?" in
Journal of Religion, pp. 22–33 (1923).
(q) "Shifting the National Mind-Set," in
Religious Education, 19:318–321 (October, 1924).
(r) "Our Changing Morals," in
Christian Century, 42:920–921 (January 16, 1925).
(s) "Youth and Peace," in
Scribner's Magazine, 78:8–13 (July, 1925).
(t) "The Week-Day Problem: Some Prior Questions," in
Religious Education, 21:35–36 (February, 1926).
(u) "Why the Dissatisfaction with Existing Curricula," in
Religious Education, 21:567–574 (December, 1926).
(v) "What Constitutes a Scientific Interpretation of Religion," in
Journal of Religion, 21:225–235 (1926).
(w) "The Problem of Standards in Christian Education," in
International Journal of Religious Education, 2:10 (December, 1925).
(x) "Training Citizens—for What?" in
World Tomorrow, pp. 151–154 (1926).
(y) "The Task Ahead, As I See It," in
Religious Education, 22:454–455 (May, 1927).
(z) "Our Two-Headed System of Religious Education," in
Religious Education, 22:564–568 (June, 1927).
(a′) "Religious Education Through Current Events," in
Religious Education, 22:803–804 (October, 1927).

(b′) "The Sphinx Attends a Meeting of the Psychological Sodality," in
Religious Education, 23:62–65 (January, 1928).
(c′) "Race Relations: Where Lies the Difficulty?" in
International Journal of Religious Education 4: 9–10 (July, 1928).
(d′) "Burning Issues," in
Religious Education, pp. 649–653 (September, 1928).
(e′) "Let Us Rethink the Purpose of Religious Education," in
Religious Education, pp. 974–978 (December, 1928).

HENRY FREDERICK COPE

A. BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

1. *The Modern Sunday School in Principle and Practice*
(No. 11 below is a revision of this book)
New York, Fleming H. Revell, 1907.
2. *The Efficient Layman:* or the religious training of man
Boston, The Pilgrim Press, 1911.
3. *The Evolution of the Sunday School*
Boston, The Pilgrim Press, 1911.
4. *Efficiency in the Sunday School*
New York, Hodder & Stoughton, 1912.
5. *Ten Years' Progress in Religious Education*
Chicago, Harmegnies & Howell, 1913.
6. *Religious Education in the Family*
Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1915.
7. *The Modern Sunday School and Its Present Day Task* (revised edition)
New York, Fleming H. Revell, 1916.
8. *Fifteen Years of the Religious Education Association*
Reprinted for private circulation from the *American Journal of Theology,* Vol. XXI, No. 3, July, 1917. Chicago, 1917.

9. *Religious Education in the Church*
New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.
10. *Education for Democracy*
New York, The Macmillan Company, 1920.
11. *Principles of Christian Service*
(Third year specialization series.)
Philadelphia, Printed for the Teacher Training Publishing Association. The Judson Press, 1921.
12. *The Weekday Church School*
New York, George H. Doran Company, 1921.
13. *Weekday Religious Education*
(Cope is editor only, but has written the introduction)
New York, George H. Doran Company, 1922.
14. *Organizing the Church School*
New York, George H. Doran Company, 1923.

B. ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

(a) "Ideals in Religious Education," in
Religious Education, 12:192–195 (June, 1917).
(b) "Promoting the Principles of Universal Brotherhood in the Family," in
Religious Education, 13:228–232 (June, 1918).
(c) "Democratic Training Through the Church," in
Religious Education, 13:401–411 (December, 1918).
(d) "Democracy Beginning at Home," in
Religious Education, 14:16–24 (February, 1919).
(e) "Making the New World," in
The Church School, 1:13 (December, 1919).
(f) "Reorganizing the Ministry," in
Biblical World, 54:15–155 (March, 1920).
(g) "The Restoration of Family Worship," in
The Church School, 1:4 (May, 1920).

(h) "New Developments in Religious Education," in
Religious Education, 15:340–342 (December, 1920).
(i) "The Curriculum of a Week-Day School," in
The Church School, 2:357 (May, 1921).
(j) "The Danger of This Hour," in
Religious Education, 16:306 (December, 1921).
(k) "Directors of Religious Education," in
The Church School, 3:185 (January, 1922).
(l) "Missionary Education Bad and Otherwise," in
The Church School, 3:215 (February, 1922).
(m) "Significance of the Week-Day Conference of the Religious Education Association," in
The Church School, 3:400 (June, 1922).
(n) "A Problem of the High School Years," in
The Church School, 4:205 (February, 1923).
(o) "A Teacher Tries a New Method," in
The Church School, 4:296 (April, 1923).

HUGH HARTSHORNE

A. BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

1. *Worship in the Sunday School*
New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1913.
2. *The Book of Worship of the Church School*
New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915.
3. *Manual for Training in Worship*
New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915.
4. *Childhood and Character*
Boston, The Pilgrim Press, 1919.
5. *Stories for Worship and How to Follow Them Up*
New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.
6. *Testing the Knowledge of Right and Wrong*
(By Hugh Hartshorne, Mark A. May, and others) Monograph No. 1
Chicago, Religious Education Association, 1927.

7. *Studies in Deceit*
(By Hugh Hartshorne and Mark A. May)
New York, The Macmillan Co., 1928.
8. *Studies in Service and Self-Control*
(By Hugh Hartshorne, Mark A. May, and Julius B. Maller)
New York, The Macmillan Co., 1929.
9. *The Organization of Character*
(By Hugh Hartshorne, Mark A. May, and Frank K. Shuttleworth)
New York, The Macmillan Co., 1930.

B. ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

(a) ''Worship in Connection with Week-Day Religious Instruction,'' in
Religious Education, 11:419–434 (October, 1916).
(b) ''Week-Day Religious Instruction and Public Education,'' in
School and Society (1916).
(c) ''Ideals in Religious Education,'' in
Religious Education, 12:185–186 (June, 1917).
(d) ''Relation of Motives to Christian Character,'' in
Religious Education, 14:75–82 (April, 1919).
(This is Chapter XIII in the author's *Childhood and Character*.)
(e) ''Measurements of Growth in Religion,'' in
Religious Education, 14:148–155 (June, 1919).
(f) ''Training in the Christian Life,'' in
Religious Education, 15:81–90 (April, 1920).
(g) ''Co-operative Study of the Religious Life of Children,'' in
Religious Education, 16:337–346 (December, 1921).
(h) ''Patriotism in Worship—A Washington's Birthday Program,'' in
The Church School, 3:217 (February, 1922).

(i) "New Light on the Weekday Church School Movement," in
The Church School, 3:398–400 (June, 1922).
(j) "A School of the Christian Life," in
The Church School, 3:454–456 (July, 1922).
(k) "The Curriculum," in
The Church School, 4:80 (November, 1922).
(l) "Worship in the Week-Day School," in
Religious Education, 17:161–163 (April, 1922).
(m) "Can Growth in Religion Be Measured?" in
Religious Education, 17:224–229 (June, 1922).
(n) "Administrative Policy and Supervision," in
The Church School, 4:271 (March, 1923).
(o) "Projects," in
The Church School, 4:421 (June, 1923).
(p) "The Meaning of Correlation, Its Educational Significance," in
The Church School, 5:10 (October, 1923).
(q) "Festivals," in
The Church School, 5:73 (November, 1923).
(r) "Worship and Childhood," in
International Journal of Religious Education, 1:18 (December, 1924).
(s) "Evoking the Experience of Worship," in
Religious Education, 20:345–348 (October, 1925).
(t) "Standards in Religious Education," in
International Journal of Religious Education, 2:23 (February, 1926).
(u) "Experimental Studies in Moral Education."
(By Hugh Hartshorne and Mark A. May)
Religious Education, 22:712–715 (September, 1927).
(v) "Discovering God Through Self-Realization in the Experience of Godlike Living," in
The Elementary Magazine, 1:3–5 (February, 1927).
(w) "Religious Education—A Point of View," in
Child Study, 5:3–5 (October, 1927).

(x) "What is Temperance Education?" in
International Journal of Religious Education (April, 1928).

(y) "Changes in Religious Education Made Possible by New Knowledge," in
Religious Education, 23:327–332 (1928).

(z) "Rethinking the Function of Worship," in
Religious Education, 23:967–973 (1928).

(a′) "Character Education in the United States," in
Encyclopedia Britannica (1929).

(b′) "Some Notes on the Objective Observation of Units of Experience," in
Religious Education, 24:347–350 (April, 1929).

(c′) "A Few Principles of Character Education," in
Religious Education, 24:813–815 (November, 1929).

NORMAN EGBERT RICHARDSON

A. BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

1. *Religious Education of Adolescents*
New York, The Abingdon Press, 1918.
2. *Religious Education and Reconstruction*
New York, The Abingdon Press, 1919.
3. *Religious Education as a Vocation*
Chicago, Northwestern University, 1920.
4. *Moral Education as a Reconstruction Problem*
New York, The Abingdon Press, 1919.
5. *Standards of Weekday Religious Education*
New York, The Abingdon Press, 1921.
6. *The Church at Play*
New York, The Abingdon Press, 1922.
7. *Education and Religion*, edited by Sherman
Chapter on "Christian Education: The Fundamental Need of the Nation."
Nashville, Tenn., Cokesbury Press, 1929.

B. ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

(a) "Parochial Schools and Religious Day Schools in Protestant Churches," in
Religious Education, 11:336–344 (August, 1916).
(b) "The Necessity for Christian Education," in
The Missionary Review of the World, 43:337–341 (May, 1920).
(c) "Aims of Week-Day Religious Education," in
Religious Education, 17:25 (February, 1922).
(d) "What Can Religious Education Do with Human Nature?" in
Religious Education, 18:25–27 (February, 1923).
(e) "Give Perishables Priority," in
International Journal of Religious Education, 2:33 (December, 1926).
(f) "A Recent Trend in Religious Education," in
International Journal of Religious Education, 4:16–17 (September, 1928).
(g) "The Rational Basis for a Peace Treaty between Character Education and Religious Education," in
Religious Education, pp. 717–718 (October, 1928).
(h) "Religious Education for Wholesome Family Life," in
Religious Education, pp. 442–446 (May, 1928).
(i) "Adult Religious Education," in
The Scots Observer (September 12, 1929).
(j) "Where There Is Life There Is Growth," in
Westminster Leader (September, 1929).
(k) "Adult Education," in
The Methodist Layman (February, 1929).

THEODORE GERALD SOARES

A. BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

1. *A Study of Adult Life*
(A textbook in the standard course in teacher-training,

outlined and approved by the Sunday School Council of Evangelical Denominations. Third Year Specialization Series)
Boston, Pilgrim Press, 1923.

2. *Religious Education*
Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1928.

B. ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

(a) "Is World Fellowship Practicable?" in
Religious Education, 16:137–140 (June, 1921).

(b) "The Opportunity of the Family in the Development of Democracy," in
Religious Education, 19:163–170 (June, 1924).

(c) "Social Progress Through Education," in
Religious Education, 19:275–277 (August, 1924).

(d) "Religious Education in the Last Twenty-five Years," in
Journal of Religion, 6:1–16 (January, 1926).

(e) "Is Religious Education Moving Forward?" in
Religious Education, 22:637–641 (June, 1927).

(f) "The Use of the Bible in Peace Education," in
International Journal of Religious Education, 4:11, 12 (June, 1928).

(g) "History of the Religious Education Association," in
Religious Education, 23:621–633 (September, 1928).

(h) "What Should Adults Study?" in
Religious Education, 24:713–716 (October, 1929).

(i) "The Meaning of Worship," in
International Journal of Religious Education, 6:9, 10 (November, 1929).

LUTHER ALLEN WEIGLE

A. BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

1. *The Pupil and the Teacher*
Philadelphia, United Lutheran Publication House, 1911.

2. *Training the Devotional Life*
(By Luther A. Weigle and Henry Hallam Tweedy)
Boston, The Pilgrim Press, 1919.
3. *Religion and War*
(Chapter 6 "The Effect of the War on Religious Education," pp. 105–121).
New Haven, Yale University Press, 1918.
4. *Talks to Sunday School Teachers*
New York, George H. Doran Company, 1920.
5. *The Training of Children in the Christian Family*
Boston, The Pilgrim Press, 1922.
6. *The Teaching Work of the Church* (chapters 1 and 2)
New York, Association Press, 1923.
7. *Report on American Education for Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work at Stockholm, 1925*
8. *Christianity and Social Adventuring* (edited by Jerome Davis, chapter on "Education")
New York, The Century Company, 1927.
9. *Religious Education*
(Vol. II, The Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council. Chapter 1, "Religious Education," by L. A. Weigle and J. H. Oldham. Chapter 7, "Christian Religious Education")
New York, International Missionary Council, 1928.
10. *What Is a Christian College?*
(An address delivered on the inauguration of Edmund Soper as president of Ohio Wesleyan University)
Federal Council Bulletin, June, 1929.
11. *Religion the Dynamic of Education* (edited by Walter M. Howlett, chapter on "Religious and Secular Education")
New York, Harper & Brothers, 1929.

B. ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

(a) "Our Religious Education in War-time," in
Pilgrim Magazine, 2:339–341.

(b) "The Home Education of Children in Prayer," in
Lutheran Church Work and Observer (April 24, 1919).
(c) "Training Children for Christ," in
Westminster Teacher (May, 1920).
(d) "Progress in Lesson Making," in
The Church School, pp. 444–448 (July, 1922).
(e) "The Biblical Argument for Graded Lessons," in
The Church School, 4:52–54 (November, 1922).
(f) "Home Training and the Problem of Authority," in
General Sunday School Board of the M. E. Church, South (1923).
(g) "What Makes Education Religious," in
Religious Education, 18:90–92 (April, 1923).
(h) "The Christian Ideal of Family Life as Expounded in Horace Bushnell's 'Christian Nurture,' " in
Religious Education, 19:47–57 (February, 1924).
(i) "Secularization of Public Education," in
Religious Education, 21:90–95 (February, 1926).
(j) "What Is Religious Education?" in
International Journal of Religious Education, 2:24 (June, 1926).
(k) "The Place of Religion in the Education of Children," in
International Journal of Religious Education, 3:14 (October, 1926).
(l) "The Task Ahead, As I See It," in
Religious Education, 22:456–457 (May, 1927).
(m) "What the Church Is Doing for Character Education; and What It Is Not Doing," in
Religious Education, 22:574–579 (June, 1927).
(n) "Educating Children in the Use of Money," in
International Journal of Religious Education, 4:10 (October, 1927).
(o) "The Home Education of Children in Prayer," in
International Journal of Religious Education, 4:13–14 (July, 1928).

(p) "The Relation of Church and State in Elementary Education," in
International Journal of Religious Education, 5:12–14 (November, 1928).
(q) "What Is It to Be a Christian?" in
Yale Divinity News (November, 1928).
(r) "Where Is Authority?" in
Yale Divinity News (November, 1929).

FRANKLIN BOBBITT

How to Make a Curriculum
New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

FREDERICK GORDON BONSER

Introduction to *The Golden Rule City*, by Edna M. Bonser
Boston, The Pilgrim Press, 1927.

GEORGE SYLVESTER COUNTS

Principles of Education (joint author with J. C. Chapman)
New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

WILLIAM HEARD KILPATRICK

"Thinking in Childhood and Youth," in
Religious Education, 23:132–140 (February, 1928).

APPENDIX II—LIST OF REFERENCES TO SOURCE QUOTATIONS

IN THE following exhibit, the references to source quotations which were used in support of each of the seven major objectives are listed, classified by such objectives. The figure or letter preceding the colon in each case is the symbol which the book or article bears in Appendix I; the figure following the colon is the page reference in the book or article. Since in the case of the leaders in general education but one title is available for each, page references only are given.

OBJECTIVE I—CHAPTER VI

Artman, d: 549; e: 154 ff.; f: 79, 80; f: 82; i: 160
Athearn, 1: 4, 5; 1: 63–65; 1: 196; 1: 258, 259; 1: 281; 4: 263; 5: 10; 8: 30; 10: 118, 119; 10: 124; 10: 137, 138; j: 28
Betts, 2: 204; 3: 29, 30; 3: 40; 4: 273, 274; 5: 23; 5: 25, 26; 5: 68; 5: 87; 6: 23, 24; c: 162; g: 86
Bower, 1: 63; 2: 11, 2: 66; 2: 82; 3: 237; 3: 258, 259; f: 29; i: 453; j: 20; r: 18, 19
Coe, 1: 62; 3: 22; 5: 36–39; 5: 195, 196; 5: 391; 7: 56; 7: 75, 76; 7: 92; 7: 94; 7: 98; 9: 47, 48; m: 94; z: 567
Cope, 4: 95; 6: 48, 49; 7: 173; 9: 78; g: 4
Hartshorne, 1: 6; 1: 27; 1: 29; 1: 45; 1: 47, 48; 3: 3; 4: 38; 4: 43; 4: 113; 4: 133; j: 456; v: 5

Richardson, 1: 41; 1: 80; 1: 85; 1: 90; 1: 167; 1: 175; 6: 78
Soares, 2: xvi–xviii; e: 639
Weigle, 1: 186; 1: 195; 1: 200; 2: 261, 262; 2: 276; 2: 346; 2: 349; 2: 351, 352; 3: 191; 5: 189, 190; 6: 40–42; 8: 269; c: 238; g: 91
Bobbitt, p. 26
Bonser, p. vii; p. xii
Counts, p. 335; p. 338; pp. 355, 356; pp. 340, 341

OBJECTIVE II—CHAPTER VII

Athearn, 1: 188, 189; 4: 263, 264; 10: 119; 10: 122; 10: 127; 10: 139; j: 28
Betts, 1: 40; 1: 86; 5: 83 ff.; 5: 87, 88; 6: 23; c: 161; g: 86
Bower, 2: 66, 67; 3: 206; f: 30; r: 18, 19
Coe, 5: 39; 5: 64; 5: 195, 196; 5: 209; 5: 405, 406; 9: 38
Cope, 4: 67; 6: 48, 49; 7: 242; 9: 78; 9: 80, 81; 9: 175
Hartshorne, 4: 113
Richardson, 1: 13; 1: 82; 1: 153; 4: 19
Soares, b: 167; e: 641
Weigle, 1: 109; 5: 189, 190; c: 237, 238; j: 25
Bonser, p. viii

OBJECTIVE III—CHAPTER VIII

Artman, e:151; e:153; f:79–82; g:31; h:586; i:153; i:160.
Athearn, 1:1; 1:6, 7; 1:98; 1:253; 1:258; 1:281; 2:5; 4:263; 5:vii; 5:147; 5:149; 8:29, 30; 9:153; 10:38, 39; 10:107; 10:122; 10:124–127; 10:136, 137; 10:139; j:27.
Betts, 1:33; 1:40; 2:31; 2:263; 2:269; 2:275; 3:28, 29; 3:40; 3:45; 4:247; 4:258; 4:285; 4:292; 5:25; 5:66, 67; 5:70–74; 5:77; 5:83, 84; b:7; b:13; c:162, 163; f:12; g:85, 86.
Bower, 2:10; 2:24–26; 2:28; 2:42, 43; 2:66–68; 2:72; 2:89; 2:133; 3:35; 3:38; 3:46; 3:54; 3:66, 67; 3:73; 3:86, 87; 3:90, 91; 3:114; 3:119; 3:134; 3:137; 3:142; 3:150; 3:152; 3:166; 3:205, 206; 3:211; 3:218; 3:222; 3:231 ff; 3:250; 3:254–257;

a:236, 237; d:21; f:29; g:469 ff.; j:20, 21; p:8; q:505; q:507 ff.; r:18, 19.

Coe, 2:311; 2:317; 2:324; 4:487, 488; 5:23; 5:120, 121; 5:134, 135; 5:195, 196; 5:286; 7:22, 23; 7:41; 7:55, 56; 7:70; 7:72, 73; 7:75, 76; 7:79–80; 7:83; 7:101, 102; 7:185; 7:190; 7:229; c:29–37; g:142.

Cope, 2:ix; 2:12; 2:15, 16; 2:43; 2:53, 2:65, 66; 2:87; 3:3, 4; 3:143; 4:5, 6; 4:10; 4:19–21; 4:38; 4:51, 52; 4:68, 69; 4:72, 73; 4:91, 92; 4:160; 4:172; 5:118; 5:145; 6:4, 5; 6:47–49; 6:55; 6:202; 7:10; 7:12; 7:37; 7:61, 62; 7:144; 7:171; 7:242, 243; 8:384; 9:18; 9:26; 9:35; 9:42; 9:47, 48; 9:78–81; 9:101–104; 9:106–108; 9:134; 9:257; 10:39; 10:42; 11:14; 12:30; 13:8; 14:17; 14:25; 14:28, 29; 14:34, 35; c:404, 405; e:13; h:340.

Hartshorne, 1:1; 1:4, 5; 1:47 ff.; 1:50; 1:160; 3:3; 4:5; 4:19; 4:43; 4:68; 4:76, 77; 4:113; 4:172; 4:182; 4:208; 4:231, 232; a:420; j:456; k:80; p:10; v:5; w:3, 4.

Richardson, 1:76, 77; 1:89; 1:111, 112; 1:128; 1:150; 1:180–182; 1:185–187; 1:190; 2:12; 2:22; 2:25; 3:5; 4:12, 13; 4:15; 4:17; 4:22; 6:27, 28; c:25.

Soares, 2:xiv; 2:xvi, xvii; 2:103, 104; b:164; e:637–639; e:641.

Weigle, 1:9, 10; 1:89; 1:109; 1:183; 1:186; 1:188; 1:190; 1:195; 1:197; 2:262; 2:326–328; 2:346; 2:348; 3:14; 3:114; 5:184–186; 5:190, 191; 5:217; 6:41, 42; 6:58, 59; 7:2; 7:15; 8:260; 8:270; c:237, 238; e:52; f:5; g:91; m:574; m:578.

Bobbitt, p. 26.

Bonser, pp. v–ix; pp. xi–xii.

Counts, pp. 340, 341; pp. 343–345; p. 351; pp. 362 ff.

Kilpatrick, pp. 133–140.

OBJECTIVE IV—CHAPTER IX

Artman, b:323; c:195, 196; e:155; f:79; f:81; j:969 ff.

Athearn, 1:69; 1:93; 1:124; 1:189, 190; 1:196, 197; 4:265; 8:25; 10:76; 10:137; j:28.

Betts, 1:63, 64; 2:270; 2:285; 2:289; 2:291 ff.; 4:281; 5:62; 5:69; 5:78; 5:83 ff.; 6:23, 24; f:11; g:87.

Bower, 1:65; 2:27–29; 2:48; 2:66; 2:69, 70; 2:85; 2:133, 134; 3:35; 3:114; 3:146; 3:152; 3:205; 3:229, 230; 3:232–234; 3:251; 3:258; d:22; j:20; q:505; q:507; q:511, 512.

Coe, 3:21; 5:16; 5:22 ff.; 5:47; 5:94, 95; 5:167, 168; 5:183; 7:viii; 7:6; 7:16–19; 7:21; 7:54–59; 7:75, 76; 7:92; 7:94; 7:98; 7:241; 8:127, 128; 9:19; 9:38; 9:47–49; 9:90; 9:92; b:130, 131; c:29–37; k:146; L:435; m:93; q:321; z:567.

Cope, 2:91; 3:3; 4:6, 7; 4:68; 5:118; 9:30; 9:36; 9:43; 9:108; 9:112, 113; 10:33, 34; 10:36–39; 10:43; 10:192; 11:2; 12:23; 12:26, 27; 12:124; 14:17, 18; 14:117; a:193; i:357; L:215

Hartshorne, 1:1; 1:4; 1:7; 1:22, 23; 4;5, 6; 4:43; 4:67; 4:76–78; 4:114; 4:159, 160; 4:181, 182; 4:209; 4:237; 4:240; 5:1; c:185, 186; j:456; w:4.

Richardson, 1:91; 2:14, 15; 2:22; 2:30; 3:18; 4:29; 6:106; b:337; b:339; b:341; d:26, 27.

Soares, 2:xvi, xvii; 2:236; b:167; e:637–639.

Weigle, 1:184–189; 2:351, 352; 3:108; 3:118; 5:12, 13; 6:42–44; 6:47; 7:2; 7:32; c:238.

Bobbitt, pp. 25 ff.

Bonser, pp. vi ff.

Counts, pp. 338 ff.; pp. 340, 341; pp. 343–345; p. 354; pp. 362 ff

Kilpatrick, p. 136.

OBJECTIVE V—CHAPTER X

Athearn, 1:253; 10:136, 137.

Betts, 2:296; 2:309; 4:307; 5:77, 78; 5:83 ff.; c:165.

Bower, 2:26, 27; 2:44; 3:230; 3:233, 234; q:505.

Coe, 7:229; c:32.

Cope, 2:91; 7:61, 62; 7:243.

Hartshorne, 4:113, 114; j:456.

Richardson, 1:156, 157; 1:184; 3:5.

Weigle, 1:186; 2:346; 6:58, 59; 7:2; c:238.

OBJECTIVE VI—CHAPTER XI

Artman, f:79, 80.
Athearn, 4:263, 264; j:28; j:30.
Betts, k:576, 577.
Bower, 2:66; q:508.
Cope, 7:29, 30; 7:242; 8:80, 81.
Hartshorne, v:5; w:4.
Soares, 2:234.
Weigle, 3:117; 6:41, 42; 7:2; 8:259; 8:269; j:24, 25; m:578.
Bobbitt, p. 26.
Bonser, p. vi ff.; p. x.
Counts, p. 330; pp. 333, 334; p. 337; p. 339; p. 341; p. 355; p. 357; p. 359; pp. 362 ff.
Kilpatrick, p. 140.

OBJECTIVE VII—CHAPTER XII

Athearn, 1:188; 1:249, 250; 4:291; 5:10; 10:108; 10:121; 10:137; b:197.
Betts, 1:67, 68; 1:70; 2:208; 2:211; 4:263, 264; 4:289; 4:301; 5:87; 6:23, 24; b:5; b:8; f:13.
Bower, 2:25; 2:65; 3:114; 3:126; 3:130; 3:142; 3:162; 3:190; 3:195; 3:199; 3:200; 3:206; 3:219; a:237.
Coe, 5:11; 5:195, 196; 5:389, 390; 7:24; 7:41; 7:64 ff.; 7:98; k:147; q:321.
Cope, 2:ix; 3:52, 53; 4:68; 4:91, 92; 7:12.
Hartshorne, 1:2 ff.; 4:5; j:456.
Richardson, 3:18.
Weigle, 1:9; 1:102, 103; 1:188; 1:193; 5:221; 8:265, 266; e:52; g:91; m:576, 577.
Bobbitt, p. 26.
Bonser, p. v–vii ff.; p. x ff.
Counts, p. 331; pp. 337 ff.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Athearn, W. S., *Character Building in a Democracy,*
New York, The Macmillan Company, 1924.

Betts, G. H., and Hawthorne, M. O., *Method in Teaching Religion,*
New York, The Abingdon Press, 1925.

Bode, B. H., *Modern Educational Theories,*
New York, The Macmillan Company, 1927.

Bower, W. C., "The Curriculum as Enriched and Controlled Experience," in
The Journal of Religion, 7:5-6 (October, 1927).

Case, Adelaide Teague, *Liberal Christianity and Religious Education,*
New York, The Macmillan Company, 1924.

Chapman, J. C., and Counts, G. S., *Principles of Education,*
Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

Charters, W. W., *The Teaching of Ideals,*
New York, The Macmillan Company, 1927.

Coe, George Albert, *Education in Religion and Morals,*
New York, Fleming H. Revell Company, 1904.

——— *A Social Theory of Religious Education,*
New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917.

——— *What Is Christian Education?*
New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.

Department of Superintendence, Fourth Yearbook, *The Nation at Work on the Public School Curriculum,*
Washington, D. C., National Education Association of the United States, 1926.

DEWEY, J., *Democracy and Education,*
New York, The Macmillan Company, 1920.

EMME, EARLE EDWARD, AND STEVICK, PAUL RAYMOND, *An Introduction to the Principles of Religious Education,*
New York, The Macmillan Company, 1926.

FISKE, G. W., *Purpose in Teaching Religion,*
New York, The Abingdon Press, 1927.

"Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council," Vol. II, *Religious Education,* New York, International Missionary Council, 1928.

KILPATRICK, W. H., *Education for a Changing Civilization,*
New York, The Macmillan Company, 1926.

KILPATRICK, W. H., *Foundations of Method,*
New York, The Macmillan Company, 1925.

MACINTOSH, DOUGLAS CLYDE, *The Reasonableness of Christianity,*
New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.

MYERS, A. J. WILLIAM, *What Is Religious Education?*
London, National Sunday School Union.

PETERS, C. C., *Foundations of Educational Sociology,*
New York, The Macmillan Company, 1924.

POWELL, WILFRED, *Growth of Christian Personality,*
St. Louis, The Bethany Press, 1929.

REEDER, EDWIN H., "What Are Life Situations?" in *Teachers College Record*, XXIX: 409-416 (February, 1928).

Research Service Bulletin No. 5, *The Development of a Curriculum of Religious Education,* Chicago, The International Council of Religious Education, 1928.

RUGG, HAROLD AND SHUMAKER, ANN, *The Child-Centered School,* Yonkers-on-Hudson,
New York, World Book Company, 1928.

RUGH, C. E., *Moral Training in the Public Schools,*
Boston, Ginn & Company, 1907.

SHAVER, E. L., *The Project Principle in Religious Education,*
Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1926.

SOARES, THEODORE GERALD, *Religious Education,*
Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1928.

UHL, WILLIS, *Secondary School Curricula,*
New York, The Macmillan Company, 1927.

VIETH, PAUL H., *Teaching for Christian Living,*
St. Louis, The Bethany Press, 1929.

WEIGLE, L. A., *et al., The Teaching Work of the Church,*
New York, The Association Press, 1923.

WHIPPLE, GUY MONTROSE (ed.), *The Foundations and Technique of Curriculum-Making,* The Twenty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education,
Bloomington, Illinois, Public School Publishing Company, 1926.

INDEX

INDEX

Activities, analysis of, 46 ff., 285
  classification of, 63 ff.
  definition of, 20
Areas of Human Experience, 58, 63 ff., 284 f.
Artman, J. M., 72, 101, 204 f.
Arts, fine, 88, 115, 265, 276 ff.
Athearn, W. S., 61, 72, 105, 133, 162, 173, 260
Attitudes, Christian, 80 f., 109 ff.

Bagley, W. C., 73
Betts, G. A., 24, 61, 71, 72, 99 f., 102, 105 f., 134, 160 f., 162, 173, 236 f., 260 f., 271
Bible, the, 36, 59 f., 88, 114, 262 ff.
Bobbitt, F., 9, 73, 106 f., 216
Bode, B. H., 45 f.
Bonser, F. G., 24, 73, 102, 171, 216 f.
Bower, W. C., 72, 99, 118, 134, 135 f., 144 f., 155, 162 f., 167, 173 f., 176, 180, 195 f., 203, 218 f., 236, 261 f., 267, 285 f.
Bradley, D., 125
Bushnell, H., 168

Case, A. T., 57 ff.
Catholic education, 6 f., 36 f.
Chapman, J. C., 9, 11 f., 109, 120, 175, 206 f., 214, 215 f., 219 ff., 224
Character, 26 ff., 66, 189 f.
  as objective, 82 ff., Chap. VIII
Character Education Inquiry, 283, 290
Charters, W. W., 20, 43, 46, 73
Christian religious education, 14 f., 121, 137, 142 f.
Christianity, 15, 58 ff., 83, 133, 142 f., 157, 204, 237, 275 f.
Church, the, 3 f., 7, 14, 23 f., 59 f., 117 f., 129, 134, 178, 181, 183
  as objective, 59, 87 f., 89 f., Chap. XI
Coe, G. A., 7 ff., 61, 72, 99, 101, 105, 116 ff., 134, 149, 153, 156, 159, 182 f., 186 f., 188, 191, 195, 203, 204, 205 f., 208, 212 f.
Conduct, 26 f., 31, 66, 118 ff., 147 f.
Conversion, 163 f.
Cope, H. F., 8, 61, 72, 113, 145, 153, 163, 202, 235
Counts, G. S., 9, 11 f., 73, 109, 120, 175, 206 f., 214, 215 f., 219 ff., 224
Courtis, S. A., 73
Creeds, 176 ff., 271 f.

Davis, C. A., 50
Democracy, 45, 144
  of God, 187, 188 f., 201 f.

Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, Committee of the, 9 f.
Dewey, J., 18 f., 33

Education, 19, 203 f.
  and religion, 5 ff., 14, 152, 172 f., 226
  as growth, 16, 97, 154 ff.
  as preparation for life, 36 ff.
  as reconstruction of experience, 29
  public, 189
Evangelism, 161 ff.

Faith, 11, 80 ff., 84, 86, 107 ff., 109 ff., 118, 122, 136, 175 f., 179, 216 ff., 224 ff., 231, 270 f.
Freedom, 167 ff.

Gambrill, 24, 26
Goals, individual, 21 ff.
  psychological, 24 f.
  social, 21 ff.
  sociological, 24 ff.
  socio-psychological, 26. *See also* Objectives
God, 10, 12 ff., 15 f., 80 ff., 97, Chap. VI, 136 ff., 165 f., 174 f., 179, 190 ff., 194, 210 ff., 217 f., 222, 225 ff., 249
Growth, 16 f., 82, 97, 125, 154 ff., 164, 285
Guidance, function of, 108, 122, 171, 172, 184 f.

Harap, H., 51 ff.
Hartshorne, H., 61, 72, 114, 182, 189 f., 197 f., 201
Hocking, W. E., 41 f.
Horn, E., 73

Ideals, religious, 82, 85, 132 ff., 194 ff., 198 ff.
Immortality, 87, 229 ff.
Indoctrination, 38, 75, 122, 127, 170 f., 177
Inglis, A., 49
International Bureau of Research, 289
International Council of Religious Education, 58, 74, 80, 102
International Educational Commission of the, 63 f., 132
International Lesson Committee, 63, 105
International Missionary Council, 74 f.
  Jerusalem Meeting, 131 f.

Jesus, 15, 23, 59 f., 80, 82, 119, Chap. VII, 161 f., 174 f., 223 f.
Judd, C. H., 73

Kelly, F. J., 73
Kilpatrick, W. H., 38, 41, 73, 169 ff., 174, 222, 269
Kingdom of God, 61, 117, 145, 187 f., 190, 196, 199 f., 209 f., 226, 261 f., 284

Lasker, B., 194
Leaders, attitude toward, 84 f., 184 f.
  list of outstanding, 72 f.
  training of, 84, 181, 183, 240 ff.
Life-situations, 29 ff.
Love, 190 ff., 215

Macintoch, D. C., 12 f., 15, 103 f., 128 f., 165 f.
Missionary education, 212 f., 247 f., 274
Morality, 11 ff., 119 f., 173 f., 192, 225 ff.

National Society for the Study of Education, Committee on Curriculum, 40, 42 f., 72 f.

Obedience to God, 81, 110
Objectives, comprehensive, 32 ff.
  current studies in, 57 ff.
  definition of, 18 ff.
  function of, 20 ff., 96 f.
  how determined, Chap. III
  method of present study of, 69 ff.
  specific, 32 ff., 70, 281 ff.
  See also Goals
Observation, objective, 27, 285 ff.

Philosophical method, 43 ff.
Philosophy of life, 86, Chap. X
Plato, 36
Public school, 6, 8, 189, 210, 228, 257

Race heritage, 88, 89 f., Chap. XII
Race prejudices, 193 f., 211 f.
Reeder, E. H., 30 f.
Religion, 6, 10 ff., 100, 153, 195 f., 199 f., 217 f., 226, 274
  experimental, 13
  fundamental, 12 ff.
  non-Christian, 273 ff.
Religious experience, personal, 83, 159 ff.
Research, curriculum, 283 ff., 292
Richardson, N. E., 72, 104, 134 f., 286
Robinson, J. H., 46 f.
Rugg, H., 73

Science and religion, 217, 221 ff.
Scientific method, 43 ff., 48 ff.
Searles, H. L., 11
Sectarian divisions, 196 f., 253 f.
Service, 30, 81, 84, 87, 115 f., 182 ff., 240 f., 245 ff.
Sin, 83, 140 f., 156 ff., 161, 228 f.
Situation, definition of, 27 ff.
  in defining specific objectives, 285 f.
  moral and religious, 166 ff.
Soares, T. G., 72, 104, 133, 217 f., 236
Society, 21 ff., 49 ff., 59, 116 f., 206 ff.
  as objective, 61, 85 f., Chap. IX
Stafford, R. H., 23

Technics, spiritual, 83, 164 ff.
Traits, Christian character, 58, 66 ff., 149 ff., 289 f.

Universe, interpretation of the, 86, 215 ff., 218 ff.

Vocations, 24, 65, 84, 180 ff.

War, prevention of, 60, 117, 207, 212
Weigle, L. A., 7, 11, 14, 23, 28 f., 49 f., 61, 62 f., 72, 98, 109, 112, 119, 136 f., 143, 163, 168 f., 172 f., 178 f., 187 f., 223 f., 225 ff., 235 f., 271 f.
Wieman, H. N., 166
Woodworth, R. S., 28
Works, G. A., 73
Worship, 81, 112 ff., 117, 197 f.

Prin. 3.

DATE DUE

~~FACULTY~~			
JUL 5	~~JUN 1 5 198~~[illegible]		
JUL 2 4 '68	~~JUN 1 5 1985~~		
AUG 6 '68			
[illegible]			
~~[illegible] 8 '6~~[illegible]	~~JUN 1 5 1987~~		
~~JAN 2 1 '69~~			
~~[illegible] '69~~			
~~[illegible] '70~~			
~~JUN 1 5 1971~~			
[illegible]			
~~MAY [illegible]~~			
~~MAY [illegible]~~			
~~JUN [illegible]~~			
~~JUN 1 5 1981~~			
~~DEC 3 1 '81~~			
~~FEB 2 [illegible]~~			
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01096 9360

DATE DUE

JAN 10 1994
JAN 10 1994

GAYLORD PRINTED IN U.S.A.